

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Public Law 86-626
H. R. 11776

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and summary of H.R. 11776	.1
Digest of Public Law 86-626	.2

INDEX AND SUMMARY OF H. R. 11776

Apr. 14, 1960	House Appropriations Committee reported H. R. 11776 without amendment. H. Report No. 1519. Print of bill and report.
Apr. 18, 1960	Summary of H. R. 11776 as reported.
Apr. 19, 1960	House began debate on H. R. 11776.
Apr. 20, 1960	House passed H. R. 11776 with amendment.
Apr. 21, 1960	H. R. 11776 was referred to the Senate Appropriations Committee. Print of bill as referred.
June 15, 1960	Senate subcommittee voted to report H. R. 11776.
June 17, 1960	Senate committee reported H. R. 11776 with amendments. S. Report No. 1611. Print of bill and report.
June 22, 1960	Senate passed H. R. 11776 with amendments. Senate conferees were appointed.
June 25, 1960	House conferees were appointed.
June 30, 1960	House received conference report. H. Report No. 2063. Print of report.
July 1, 1960	Both Houses agreed to the conference report on H. R. 11776.
July 12, 1960	Approved: Public Law 86-626.

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 86-626

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1961. Includes funds for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Civil Service Commission, Federal Power Commission, Federal Trade Commission, General Accounting Office, General Services Administration, Interstate Commerce Commission, National Science Foundation, Selective Service System, and Veterans Administration.

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

Issued April 15, 1960
For actions of April 14, 1960
86th-2d, No. 69

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	7,25
Appropriations.....	2,11,34
Area redevelopment.....	32
Casein imports.....	12
Chicory imports.....	3
Civil action.....	35
Cooperatives.....	15,30
Electrification.....	41
Ethics.....	28
Farm loans.....	37
Farm program.....	15,27,40
Fiber imports.....	13
Foreign aid.....	17
Forestry.....	4,26
Grain storage.....	9
Industrial agent.....	39
Item veto.....	34
Lands.....	38
Legislative program.....	6
Life insurance.....	23
Milk.....	8
Nomination.....	20
Packers and stockyards.....	16
Personnel.....	23,31,35
Research.....	22
Ryukyu Islands.....	1
Science.....	22
Special milk.....	8
Sugar.....	10,27,33
Textile imports.....	39
Transportation.....	5,14
User charges.....	21
Water resources.....	19
Watersheds.....	11
Wheat.....	27
Wild animals.....	18
Wilderness areas.....	24
Wool.....	36

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate agreed to conference report on special milk bill. Sen. Symington criticized USDA grain storage policies. Sen. Smathers urged reassessment of sugar quotas for Cuba. Senate passed bill to expand authority to make additional loans for watershed protection. House committee reported independent offices appropriation bill. House subcommittee voted to report bill for multiple use management of national forests. Sen. Ellender and other Senators and Reps. Boggs and Willis introduced and Sen. Ellender discussed sugar bill. Rep. Cooley introduced bill to revise Farmers Home Administration laws. Rep. Schwengel submitted and discussed item veto measures. Rep. Poage introduced and discussed farm program bill.

HOUSE

1. RYUKYU ISLANDS. The Armed Services Committee reported with amendment H. R. 1157, to provide for the promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands (H. Rept. 1517). p. 7508
2. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11776, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1961 (H. Rept. 1519).
~~p. 7508~~
3. CHICORY; IMPORTS. Agreed to the Senate amendment to H. R. 9307, to continue for two years the existing suspension of import duty on certain alumina and bauxite.

This amendment extends for 90 days (until July 16, 1960) the existing suspension of import duty on crude chicory and the reduction in duty on ground chicory (p. 7496). This bill will now be sent to the President.

4. FORESTRY. The Forests Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 10572, to direct that the national forests be managed under principles of multiple use and to produce a sustained yield of products and services. p. D310
5. TRANSPORTATION. Both Houses received from GSA proposed legislation "to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders"; to Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees. pp. 7436, 7508
6. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert stated that the program for Apr. 19 would include calling of the Consent Calendar, consideration (under suspension of rules) of H. R. 8074, the agricultural attache rotation bill, and the independent offices appropriation bill for 1961. On Wed. and for the balance of the week, he said, the House will consider the mutual security authorization bill. pp. 7496-7
7. ADJOURNED until Mon., Apr. 18. p. 7508

SENATE

8. SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM. Received and agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9331, the special milk bill (pp. 7452-3). As agreed to the bill increases by \$4 million (to \$85 million) for the fiscal year 1960, and by \$11 million (to \$95 million) for the fiscal year 1961, the maximum amount of CCC funds which may be used for the special milk program, and authorizes to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1961, separate from any other appropriation of funds for CCC, such amount as may be deemed to be necessary to reimburse CCC for amounts advanced for the special milk program.
9. GRAIN STORAGE. Sen. Symington criticized the Department's grain storage operations, contended that "unless and until, the Department of Agriculture has the same type and character of cost information about grain storage that any businessman has about his costs, the grain storage program can never be handled with fairness and efficiency," and listed several types of information he hopes to obtain regarding grain storage operations. pp. 7453-4
10. SUGAR. Sen. Smathers criticized recent activities in Cuba and urged a re-assessment of "the preferential sugar quota for the Cuban Government" which "gives to Cuba in the neighborhood of \$375 million a year." pp. 7446-7
11. WATERSHED PROJECTS. Passed with amendments H. R. 4781, to make the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act applicable to the 11 major watershed projects included in the watershed improvement programs authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944. (p. 7461) The committee report on the bill states that the purpose of one of the amendments "is designed to make clear the committee's intention that all appropriations for both works of improvement and loans in connection with the 11 watershed programs shall be carried in the same appropriation item, separate from the appropriation item applicable to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act."

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

APRIL 14, 1960.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 11776]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The estimates considered by the Committee are contained in the 1961 Budget in sections for the Executive Office of the President, pages 67 to 74; Independent Offices, pages 101 to 230; General Services Administration, pages 231 to 268; Housing and Home Finance Agency, pages 269 to 304; and Budget amendments contained in House Documents No. 328, 329 and 371.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL

The budget estimates considered total \$8,416,897,000 and the Committee is recommending \$8,146,167,400 for appropriation. This is an increase of \$1,108,360,200 over 1960 appropriations and a reduction of \$270,729,600 in the 1961 budget estimates. Practically every agency wants an increase in personnel. The budget estimates proposed an increase of about 7,900 new positions, not including a 5,400 transfer from Department of the Army funding to the NASA budget in 1961, and the Committee has allowed 4,700, a reduction of 3,200. The two greatest increases go to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Federal Aviation Agency.

The following table sets forth in summary form a comparison of the budget estimates for 1961 and appropriations recommended in the bill for each agency. A detailed tabulation for each item of appropriation is at the end of this report.

Agency	Budget estimates, 1961	Recommended in bill	Bill compared with budget estimates
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.....	\$76,350,000	\$51,900,000	—\$24,450,000
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	76,584,000	67,285,000	—9,299,000
Civil Service Commission.....	71,642,000	70,775,000	—867,000
Federal Aviation Agency.....	713,000,000	671,925,000	—41,075,000
Federal Communications Commission.....	13,500,000	12,935,000	—565,000
Federal Power Commission.....	7,795,000	7,532,000	—263,000
Federal Trade Commission.....	7,600,000	7,415,000	—185,000
General Accounting Office.....	41,150,000	41,150,000	-----
General Services Administration.....	507,252,000	465,781,000	—41,471,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	332,187,000	328,377,000	—3,810,000
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	20,500,000	19,777,000	—723,000
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	915,000,000	876,015,000	—38,985,000
National Capital Housing Authority.....	41,000	40,000	—1,000
National Science Foundation.....	191,600,000	160,000,000	—31,600,000
Renegotiation Board.....	2,870,000	2,870,000	-----
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	8,900,000	8,525,000	—375,000
Selective Service System.....	32,950,000	30,278,400	—2,671,600
Veterans Administration.....	5,397,976,000	5,323,587,000	—74,389,000
Total.....	8,416,897,000	8,146,167,400	—270,729,600

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

The Committee recommends \$51,900,000 for civil defense in 1961, which is included in five appropriation paragraphs in the bill. This is \$985,000 less than the total appropriations for 1960, and a reduction of \$24,450,000 in the budget requests.

Salaries and expenses.—An appropriation of \$24,700,000 is recommended for this item, which is an increase of \$1,415,000 over the 1960 appropriation on a comparable basis and a reduction of \$1,050,000 in the budget request. The bill provides for a staff of 303 in the District of Columbia national headquarters office, 660 in the Battle Creek operational headquarters office, and 691 in the eight regional field offices. The Office of Defense Mobilization and the Federal Civil Defense Administration were consolidated into one agency by Executive Order several years ago and it was expected that there would be consolidation of activities, yet to a large degree the functions have continued separately. The funds provided continue the same staffing level as in the current year except for the District of Columbia office, which has been reduced by 50 jobs in grade GS-11 and above. Increases requested for objects of expense other than personal services have been substantially approved, with some reduction in printing and travel.

Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.—The Committee recommends \$6,250,000 for allocation by the OCDM to various Federal agencies to administer delegated responsibilities. The budget estimate proposed increasing the amount by \$3,750,000 but the Committee has approved the same level of funding as in the current year.

Federal contributions.—An appropriation of \$10,000,000 is recommended for matching grant programs during fiscal year 1961. This continues at the same level the old matching grant programs for equipment, training and certain other purposes, but does not provide the \$12,000,000 requested to implement the program of matching grants for personnel and administrative expenses of State and local civil defense organizations authorized in Public Law 85-606. The bill includes language prohibiting the use of funds for this purpose.

Emergency supplies and equipment.—The Committee has approved \$6,950,000 for maintaining the stockpile of emergency supplies and equipment, including emergency hospitals, radiological instruments, medical and surgical supplies. The amount allowed is the same as the 1960 appropriation and is \$4,450,000 below the budget estimate. No reduction has been made in the request for funds for drugs and plasma.

Research and development.—The Committee recommends \$4,000,000 for continuing the research and development program at its present level. The item as approved includes \$2,500,000 for completing the two-year program of fallout shelter prototype construction and such funds have been earmarked in the bill.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

The Committee recommends \$7,285,000 for salaries and expenses of the Board next year. This provides an increase of \$360,000 over the current appropriation and \$315,000 less than the budget estimate. It will provide an increase of 36 positions which are to be used to strengthen the audit staff. The Committee has the impression the Board is shuffling too many papers that result in building up an unnecessary backlog of work. Its efforts should be concentrated on its most essential duties.

An appropriation of \$60,000,000 is recommended for payment of subsidies to local air carriers. This is an increase of \$1,500,000 over 1960 and a reduction of \$8,984,000 in the budget estimate. During the hearings the Committee expressed its concern to the Board that it is not auditing subsidy payments on a current basis, but makes monthly payments and audits the accounts only annually. It is also suggested that the Board examine its policies to be assured that carriers receiving subsidies are not encouraged to raise borrowed instead of equity capital by receiving a subsidy on their borrowed money.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The Committee has approved \$19,230,000 for salaries and expenses to continue the present level of employment in 1961. The amount recommended is \$800,000 less than the amount requested. The Committee has specifically denied \$30,000 included in the estimates for

printing the Official Register, and the net increase over 1960 with this adjustment is \$140,000 to provide for the added cost of the new health benefits program.

The budget proposed \$467,000 for security investigations of United States citizens applying for employment by international organizations, and the Committee has allowed \$400,000, the same amount as in 1960.

The Committee has approved the budget estimate of \$2,316,000 for payment of annuities under special acts to persons employed in the construction of the Panama Canal or their widows, and widows of former employees of the Lighthouse Service.

A new item of \$2,500,000 is included in the Budget this year for the Government's share of payments for health insurance for persons retiring after July 1, 1960. The Committee has approved the budget estimate.

Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund.—The Committee regrets that the Budget has not included the \$944,000,000 that is necessary to pay the Government's cost to the retirement fund and keep the fund current for this year. Two years ago a Presidential veto prevented the Congress from providing the necessary funds by annual appropriation as the costs were accrued. The deficiency in the fund therefore continues to increase and on June 30, 1959, was at \$28.363 billion. The Committee points out that the taxpayer has a deferred obligation that must be paid at some time in the future inasmuch as the Government is not now paying its costs with annual appropriations on a systematic basis.

The \$46,329,000 included in the bill for payment to the fund is solely to cover the increased cost of the temporary increase in annuity provided in PL 85-465 to certain retired employees and their survivors during fiscal year 1961. By appropriating this amount, which is the budget request, the annuitants will continue to receive their increased annuities as the law requires an annual appropriation to cover such cost if the increased rates are to be continued.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

The budget estimates for this agency for 1961 total \$713,000,000. The Committee recommends appropriations in the bill totaling \$671,925,000, which is an increase of \$113,930,000 over fiscal year 1960, and \$41,075,000 less than the amounts requested.

Expenses.—The bill contains \$365,245,000 for this item to provide for the normal operating expenses of the agency. This is an increase of \$63,545,000 over the current year appropriation and a reduction of \$17,755,000 in the budget estimate. This appropriation provides for operation of a total of 4,646 separate facilities, including 347 communication flight service stations, 37 air traffic control centers, 257 air traffic control towers, and 4,005 automatic facilities.

The Committee has made no reduction in the request for personnel to operate the facilities, but has allowed approximately one-half of the new jobs requested for other types of activities, such as planning and supervision, warehousing, maintenance and overhaul, training, supporting services, and has denied a part of the increases requested for other objects. The funds allowed provide a substantial increase over the operating level for the current year and no request for essential work has been denied.

There are 391 employees engaged in research direction at the present time and the Committee has allowed an increase of 62 for next year, or one-half the increase proposed. The bill also includes half of the increase proposed for the flight standards program. The request for 43 additional employees to administer the airport program has been denied as there is no apparent reason for an increase in staff in the airport program this year. Funds proposed to establish civil air attachés in U.S. embassies abroad have also been denied.

Establishment of air navigation facilities.—The Committee recommends \$152,500,000 for this purpose, which is an increase of \$34,300,000 over the 1960 appropriation including the \$17,000,000 transferred from this appropriation item to Expenses in the current year, and \$21,500,000 less than the budget estimate. Funds provided are to maintain the present level of 1,741 positions. It was testified that the level of activity for the next five years would be at about \$158,000,000. In addition to funds in this bill an unobligated balance of approximately \$65,000,000 will be carried over from the 1960 appropriation.

The original budget estimates for new facilities included \$31,000,000 to provide space and equipment in air defense combat centers for FAA high altitude air traffic control functions. There has been a recent change in plans and a budget amendment reduced the request by \$21,000,000. The Committee has also withheld the other \$10,000,000 in the request for funds for equipment related to the old plan until it is determined what part of it will be needed under a new plan yet to be developed.

Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization).—The Committee has approved the \$80,000,000 budget estimate for payment of Federal matching grants to municipalities for airport construction projects as authorized by the Federal Airport Act. This is an increase of \$32,500,000 over 1960.

Research and development.—An appropriation of \$64,000,000 is recommended for continuing research and development activities in 1961. This is an increase of \$15,275,000 over 1960. The full request of \$47,375,000 is approved for research and development to improve air safety conducted primarily by contracts with industry, and the Committee expects the FAA to supervise these contracts carefully as this is a field that invites waste. The only reduction in this item is \$1,000,000 from the \$17,625,000 proposed for operation of the National Aviation Facilities Experimental Center. The amount allowed is an increase of \$5,506,000 over 1960.

National Capital airports.—The Committee is recommending \$3,230,000 for operation and maintenance of Washington National Airport, and \$4,500,000 for construction. This is a reduction of \$49,800 in the budget estimate for operation and maintenance and \$500,000 in the request for construction.

The Committee has included language in the bill to provide separately for the Dulles International Airport which will begin operation during the fiscal year. The budget estimate for this purpose is \$2,720,200 and the Committee has allowed \$2,450,000.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Salaries and expenses.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$12,935,000 for this Commission. The increase of \$2,385,000 over 1960 includes \$385,000 for 31 of the 62 new positions requested.

The Committee has also approved \$2,000,000, a reduction of \$250,000 in the request, for a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of ultra-high frequency television transmission and reception. The technical information that will be obtained is essential to the Commission in allocating channels in the UHF spectrum.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The bill contains \$1,943,000 for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. This is an increase of \$143,000 over the 1960 authorization and a reduction of \$132,000 in the budget estimate.

The Committee has also approved \$787,500 for the administrative expenses of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, or an increase of \$12,500 over this year and a reduction of \$12,500 in the budget estimate.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The Committee recommends \$7,532,000 for this Commission in 1961. This is an increase of \$314,000 over the current year appropriation and will provide funds for 42 additional positions, one-half the number requested, and the new health benefits program. A reduction of \$263,000 has been made in the budget estimate.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The Committee has approved \$7,415,000 which will provide for 75 of the 99 new positions requested. The amount provided is \$185,000 less than the budget estimate and an increase of \$575,000 over the 1960 appropriation. The Commission is urged to stress anti-monopoly and anti-merger work and the amount approved is for 73 new positions in investigations and 2 additional hearing examiners.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

The Committee has approved the \$41,150,000 budget estimate for this Office. This is \$650,000 less than the 1960 appropriation and is for the only agency in the bill which is requesting a lesser amount in 1961 than in the current year. The Committee is of the opinion there is no better public servant than the present Comptroller General, Mr. Campbell. Under his capable direction the Office he heads administers its vast duties and responsibilities energetically and with integrity.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

The total amount contained in the bill for the General Services Administration is \$465,781,000. This is an increase of \$189,054,200 over the appropriations for the current fiscal year and a reduction of \$41,471,000 in the amounts of the budget estimates.

Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service.—The Committee has allowed \$160,850,000 for this item for the operation of all Government-owned and leased buildings under the control of the General Services Administration in 1961. The appropriation for the current year is \$151,000,000, and the budget estimate for 1961 is \$170,500,000. The amount of appropriation recommended by the Committee allows

about half the increase requested for rental and operation of new space, and includes the \$826,000 requested for the new health benefits program. The Committee observes that although many new public buildings are being completed which should reduce the Government rental requirements, the demands for additional office space continue to increase.

The Committee is aware of the lack of authority of the Administrator in allocating space. He has no authority to tell an agency how much it can use, regardless of how much is being wasted. The existing law gives to the Administrator the authority to allocate space, but the President prescribes the regulations under which he must administer such duties.

The Administration is urged to issue an Executive Order giving the Administrator the authority he needs to tell agencies how much space they can have. Such a request has been pending in the Bureau of the Budget for several months and the Committee is of the opinion it should be issued as it will save the Government millions of dollars annually.

Repair and improvement of public buildings.—An appropriation of \$58,000,000 is recommended to continue the program of maintenance and repair of public buildings. The amount approved is \$2,000,000 less than the budget estimate and the amount appropriated for this purpose in 1960. The Committee has disallowed the request for funds to make alterations to existing buildings to provide fallout shelters.

Construction, public buildings projects.—The Committee is recommending \$144,836,000 for public buildings construction projects in 1961. This will provide funds for construction of 18 projects and 2 major renovations at the locations listed in the following table.

Public buildings projects included in the bill

Location	Sites and expenses	Construction cost	Total
Camden, Arkansas.....	\$142, 000	\$633, 250	\$775, 250
San Francisco, California.....	4, 223, 000	37, 286, 100	41, 509, 100
Hartford, Connecticut.....	1, 199, 000	7, 636, 400	8, 835, 400
Miami, Florida.....	607, 000	7, 076, 250	7, 683, 250
Thomasville, Georgia.....	107, 000	1, 094, 600	1, 201, 600
Jackman, Maine.....	34, 000	289, 850	323, 850
Van Buren, Maine.....	119, 000	284, 750	403, 750
Vanceboro, Maine.....	49, 000	254, 150	303, 150
Detroit, Michigan.....	83, 000	874, 650	957, 650
Sweetgrass, Montana.....	358, 000	586, 500	944, 500
Albuquerque, New Mexico.....	50, 000	469, 200	519, 200
Bismarck, North Dakota.....	607, 000	3, 224, 050	3, 831, 050
Toledo, Ohio.....	889, 000	3, 867, 700	4, 756, 700
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.....	224, 000	5, 601, 500	5, 825, 500
Memphis, Tennessee.....	1, 894, 000	9, 587, 150	11, 481, 150
El Paso, Texas.....	100, 000	1, 055, 700	1, 155, 700
Dayton, Washington.....	30, 000	282, 200	312, 200
FOB No. 9, District of Columbia.....	2, 759, 000	20, 031, 100	22, 790, 100
FOB No. 10, District of Columbia.....	3, 897, 000	38, 326, 500	42, 223, 500
U.S. Court of Claims and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.....	460, 000	6, 375, 000	6, 835, 000
Total program (20 projects).....	17, 831, 000	144, 836, 000	162, 667, 000

The prospectuses for these projects have already been approved by the legislative committee of the House with the exception of projects in the District of Columbia, and all are included in the Budget program for funding in 1961 with the exception of FOB #9 in the District of Columbia which has been substituted by the Committee for FOB #8. There are seven other large projects at Los Angeles, California, Denver, Colorado, Chicago, Illinois, New York, N.Y., Cincinnati, Ohio, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and Dallas, Texas, not included in the bill where the design will be completed sometime during the year but where construction funds were not requested. The total improvement cost of such projects is \$242,143,000, and funds for construction should be considered for 1962.

The improvement cost for each project included in the bill has been reduced 15 percent from the estimates. The Administrator through good administration has made a 20 percent saving to date on the projects that have already been completed, and the cost estimates for the 20 projects in the bill quite evidently have more than adequate latitude for contingencies. The actual reduction made by the Committee is in the order of 9 to 10 percent when the cost of fallout shelters is excluded. Funds are specifically disallowed for installing a fallout shelter in each project. In arriving at the final plans and specifications the Committee desires that good, substantial, and usable buildings be completed, but strongly urges the Administrator to leave out all unnecessary features and trimmings, and that no architect be permitted to build a local monument to himself.

Sites and expenses.—The Committee has approved \$25,000,000 for sites and expenses as a separate appropriation item in the bill. This is the same amount as the 1960 appropriation. Such expenses were included in the budget estimates as part of a single appropriation for public buildings acquisition and construction.

In testifying before the Committee the Administrator indicated a requirement for approximately \$3 billion representing 700 to 800 projects for new buildings over a period of about 10 years to bring the public buildings program into a reasonably current status. Thirty-one new projects are contemplated in the budget request for sites and planning, and the Committee has provided funds for the planning of additional projects. The bill also contains necessary language to make \$5,500,000 available for demolition and installation of footings for the project approved for Chicago, Illinois, so the project may proceed to construction at the proper time.

This appropriation item includes funds for all the sites and planning projects which have been approved by the legislative committee to date.

Payments, public buildings purchase contracts.—The bill contains \$4,000,000 for payments of principal, interest, taxes and other expenses in connection with lease purchase arrangements under the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954. During the past year the Administrator has arranged to prepay contracts on 9 projects with a saving of \$3,700,000 to the Government. Since some of these contracts were prepaid subsequent to the preparation of the budget estimates the funds included in this item for payment under such contracts will not now be needed, and the Committee has accordingly reduced the request by \$630,000.

Construction of relocation facilities.—The Committee has denied the request of \$3,800,000 for construction of relocation facilities at sites around Washington, D.C. The estimate for 1961 contemplated

beginning a program of construction at eleven relocation sites costing an average of \$1.8 to \$1.9 million each.

Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service.—The bill includes \$6,960,000 for operation of personal property management activities in 1961. This is an increase of \$960,000 over 1960 and \$540,000 less than the budget estimate for 1961. The bill provides that \$3,716,500 shall be by appropriation, and that \$3,243,500 of proceeds from the sale of excess personal property may also be used.

The Committee has approved an increase of \$900,000 for strengthening the utilization and sales program of excess personal property, and funds for the new health benefits program. The Committee recognizes the difficult problems associated with surplus property, but will expect GSA to demonstrate with specific illustrations next year what is being accomplished with the additional funds in the bill before any further increase is granted.

Expenses, supply distribution.—The bill includes \$22,950,000 for operation of the General Services Administration supply system. This is an increase of \$1,500,000 over the 1960 appropriation and is a reduction of \$350,000 in the budget request. It was testified that stores sales volume is expected to continue to expand in 1961. In 1958 stores sales were \$135.1 million, in 1959 the amount increased to \$167.6 million, in 1960 it is estimated at \$180.5 million, and in 1961 is expected to go to \$202.7 million. The entire increase allowed by the Committee is for the stores operations and the new health benefits program.

Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$9,420,000 for this item, which is an increase of \$243,200 over the current fiscal year and a reduction of \$180,000 in the budget estimate. The increase will provide 15 additional employees to administer 450,000 additional cubic feet of records that are anticipated in 1961, and for the added cost of the new health program.

Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service.—The budget proposed an appropriation of \$2,400,000 for this Service in 1961, including \$325,200 for financing directly certain services which in 1960 were financed with reimbursements from other appropriations. The Committee has approved an appropriation of \$2,375,000, which provides for the same staff level as in 1960, with an adjustment for the cost of the new health benefits program. The amount recommended is \$25,000 less than the request.

Strategic and critical materials.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$30,000,000 for maintaining the national stockpile of strategic and critical materials, and language is included in the bill making available the unobligated balance carried forward from 1960 estimated at \$3,668,000. This is a reduction of \$9,132,000 in the request for funding contained in the budget estimate, including the \$5,896,000 requested for further upgrading of materials in 1961 which the Committee has disallowed.

The 1960 appropriation bill included language authorizing the General Services Administration to sell materials scheduled for rotation without replacing them whenever the quantities of such materials in the stockpile were already excess to the Government's needs. This program has worked extremely well, and it will enable the Government to recoup \$37,500,000 of its investment in surplus goods during

1960 and return the funds to the Treasury. The principal item being sold is natural rubber.

The Committee has not included the provision in the bill for 1961 inasmuch as legislation is pending in the Congress to accomplish the major objectives of the provision. However, such legislation relates only to the disposal of natural rubber, and the Committee recommends to the Congress that further consideration be given to the far greater problem of developing similar objectives for disposing of other materials as \$4.1 billion of the \$8.4 billion Government investment in materials is excess to maximum stockpile objectives.

Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator.—The Committee has allowed the budget request of \$240,000 for the Administrator's staff, which is a \$15,000 increase over the 1960 appropriation. The Committee is agreed that the present Administrator, Mr. Floete, is one of the finest and most capable executives in the Government today.

Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents.—The budget request of \$250,000 for this item has been allowed. This appropriation provides for allowances and other expenses authorized by law for three former Presidents, including the present incumbent, and pensions for two widows of former Presidents.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Office of the Administrator, salaries and expenses.—The bill contains \$10,327,000 for administrative expenses of the Office of the Administrator, which includes the Urban Renewal Administration. This is an increase of \$985,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year and is a reduction of \$310,000 in the budget estimate. Programs financed from this appropriation are continued at the same level as in the current year, including \$250,000 for the Voluntary Home Mortgage Credit Program, but the Committee has approved 125 of the 138 new positions requested for urban renewal.

Urban planning grants.—The bill contains \$4,000,000 for matching grants to State, metropolitan, or regional planning areas to help finance surveys and urban renewal plans in small cities and metropolitan or regional areas. This is \$625,000 more than the appropriations in 1960, including a supplemental appropriation of \$1,650,000 pending at the present time, and \$750,000 less than the amount requested.

Reserve of planned public works (payment to revolving fund).—The bill provides \$6,000,000 for payment to this fund, bringing the total capital to \$36,000,000. This is a reduction of \$1,000,000 in the estimate, and is the same as the appropriation in 1960. This program provides interest-free advances to State and local public agencies for the planning of local public works, and the loans are repaid when the project is placed under construction. A \$48,000,000 fund is authorized.

Grants for slum clearance and urban renewal.—The Committee has allowed the \$150,000,000 budget estimate to liquidate a portion of the contracts outstanding for capital grant contributions. On July 1, 1960, the Urban Renewal Administration will have authorization to award \$2 billion in grant contracts under its program, which must be liquidated by appropriations at some time in the future as projects are completed. Congress has abdicated its control over this vast program. The Committee expects this appropriation to be adequate to finance all requirements for this program in the year ahead.

Housing for the elderly (payment to revolving fund).—The Committee has included in the bill \$5,000,000 to initiate a pilot program in the area of critical need of housing for the elderly. There is no budget estimate for this item.

The Housing Act of 1959 authorized appropriations for a \$50,000,000 revolving fund for loans at interest rates one-fourth of one percent over the average rate on all interest bearing obligations of the United States at the end of the preceding fiscal year. The loans can have terms up to 50 years and can cover 98 percent of total development cost. The program is for loans to assist private non-profit corporations where they cannot get equally favorable private financing.

The Committee suggests that the funds be used for several projects located in widely separated parts of the United States. It will expect the agency to proceed expeditiously in getting the test projects underway and will be looking forward to a report on the results of the program next year.

Housing studies.—The request for \$600,000 for a program of housing studies through contractual arrangements has been disallowed. Similar studies have been made in the past with questionable results, and the program was specifically disallowed in 1954 and has not been resumed since.

College housing loans (limitation on administrative expenses).—The bill provides \$1,260,000 for administrative expenses of the college housing loan program, which is \$463,000 less than the amount of limitation for the current fiscal year and \$140,000 less than the budget estimate. The lesser amount is provided on the premise that the program will not be continued and there will be no new lending activities in the new fiscal year.

Public facility loans (limitation on administrative expenses).—The Committee has allowed \$477,000 for administrative expenses in connection with this program. This is \$48,000 less than the amount in the current year and a reduction of \$53,000 in the budget estimate.

Revolving fund (liquidating programs).—The bill includes a limitation of \$139,500 on administrative expenses that may be used for programs in liquidation or servicing status. The reduction of \$513,500 below the current level is due to decreased workload resulting from the transfer of 14,242 mortgage notes for Lanham Act properties in the principal amount of \$167.7 million to the Federal National Mortgage Association for servicing during the current year.

Federal National Mortgage Association.—The bill provides \$6,550,000 for administrative expenses of the Association. This amount of limitation is an increase of \$400,000 over the allowance for the current year, including \$100,000 pending in a supplemental appropriation bill, and is \$100,000 less than the budget estimate. The portfolio of the Association in its secondary market operations has been increasing in the past year, and mortgage purchases are estimated to continue to increase in 1961.

Federal Housing Administration.—The Committee is recommending \$8,450,000 for administrative expenses in 1961, which is an increase of \$350,000 over 1960 and is a reduction of \$350,000 in the budget estimate. The amount of limitation approved includes 25 additional positions for the controller division for mortgage insurance activities.

The Committee has allowed the full \$50,000,000 requested for non-administrative expenses related to processing workloads of mortgage

insurance applications, which is \$2,000,000 more than the current year. However, the new budget language authorizing up to 15 percent additional on a contingency basis is not approved. If an emergency should arise staff can be shifted between field offices as it is unlikely that all offices would be affected at the same time, or if the situation is totally unanticipated additional funds can be provided by the Congress.

Language is also included in the bill this year making it clear that all appraisal and other fees used in administering the programs, whether paid by the Federal Housing Administration or the mortgagee, are to be included within the nonadministrative expenses limitation so as to present a true accounting of the agency's operations. There is adequate latitude within the nonadministrative expenses allowed in the bill to include such fees on the basis of workload now anticipated and past cost experience for administering the same amount of work.

Public Housing Administration.—The bill provides \$140,000,000 for payment of annual contributions to local public housing authorities. This is an increase of \$20,000,000 over the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1960 and is a reduction of \$6,000,000 in the budget estimate for 1961. On June 30, 1960, there will be 474,418 units in 2,586 projects in the program, and 23,000 new public housing units are expected to come into occupancy in 1961 and will be eligible for annual contributions payments. The final requirements can only be estimated at this time as it depends on the completion dates for new projects and the results of audit of project accounts by PHA, but the basic requirements are contractual obligations.

The Committee recommends a \$13,050,000 limitation on administrative expenses, which is an increase of \$220,000 over the amount for this purpose in 1960 and \$150,000 less than the budget estimate for 1961. The funds allowed will provide 15 additional employees for auditing project accounts, and \$70,000 for the agency cost of the new health insurance program.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Committee recommends \$19,777,000 for salaries and expenses of the Commission in 1961. This is a \$127,000 increase over the current year appropriation and \$723,000 less than the budget estimate. The appropriation recommended provides no increase in staff in 1961, but allows for the added cost of the new employee health insurance program.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Committee has considered total budget estimates of \$915,000,000 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in 1961 and is recommending \$876,015,000 for appropriation. This is an increase of \$375,440,000 over appropriations in 1960 and is \$38,985,000 less than the amounts requested in the budget estimates.

Salaries and expenses.—The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$166,500,000 for this purpose in fiscal year 1961. This is an increase of \$75,100,000 over the 1960 appropriation and is a reduction of \$4,260,000 in the budget request. This is for 16,000 jobs, an in-

crease of 5,989 in 1961. The staff increases requested in the budget estimate include 75 for headquarters over the maximum approved staffing for 1960, 786 for the Goddard Center, 75 at the Wallops Station, 5,400 at the Marshall Center, and 26 at three area offices. However, most of the positions at the Marshall Center are in the nature of a transfer from Army funding to NASA in 1961.

The Committee is not specifying where the increased staff over 1960 shall be applied, but has reduced the total requested by 373 positions. Substantially more than a proportionate part of the positions disallowed are from the staffing level proposed for the headquarters office which already is overstaffed in number of jobs and salary grades, including the number of excepted positions. In addition to the 16,000 approved positions funded from this appropriation, an additional 2,400 for the staff at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory are financed by contract from the Research and Development appropriation, which gives a total of 18,400 jobs next year.

In arriving at the recommended appropriation, the Committee has made no reduction in the request for certain fixed items, such as electric power, rental of essential equipment, or life insurance, health and retirement contributions. Other indefinite elements of expense total \$9,363,000. These have been reduced by \$1,300,000 including travel, which is increased in the estimates from \$2,866,400 to \$5,849,000.

The Committee has included language in the bill limiting to \$10,000 the amount available upon the approval or authority of the Administrator for entertainment and extraordinary expenses, which is one-half the amount authorized in the legislative authorization.

Research and development.—The budget proposes an appropriation of \$621,453,000 for the costs of research, development, procurement, and operations contracts in 1961. The Committee has approved a total of \$602,240,000 in funding for these programs. The amount provided is \$266,890,000 more than the appropriation in 1960 and is a reduction of \$19,213,000 in the budget estimate. The Committee has allowed the full \$277,608,000 requested for rocket and rocket vehicle development which includes the Saturn program as well as others, and in addition there is \$105,000,000 for the Mercury program, totaling \$382,608,000, which is reduced by the token amount of \$2,750,000. The Committee directs that closer attention be given to contractor costs. This is the field that invites the most waste. The budget estimate and the amount allowed for all programs in research and development is as follows:

Research and development programs

Program	Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961	Recom- mended in bill
Aeronautical and space research:			
Support of NASA plant-----	\$22, 684, 000	\$51, 345, 000	\$46, 210, 000
Research grants and contracts--	4, 950, 000	10, 000, 000	5, 000, 000
Scientific investigations in space:			
Sounding rockets-----	8, 811, 000	8, 000, 000	7, 600, 000
Scientific satellites-----	23, 813, 000	41, 700, 000	40, 000, 000
Lunar and planetary exploration--	49, 000, 000	45, 000, 000	45, 000, 000
Satellite applications:			
Meteorology-----	7, 930, 000	20, 700, 000	19, 500, 000
Communications-----	3, 170, 000	5, 600, 000	5, 400, 000
Manned space flight-----	74, 962, 000	107, 750, 000	105, 000, 000
Vehicles systems technology-----	6, 737, 000	21, 200, 000	20, 000, 000
Space propulsion technology:			
Solid rockets-----	3, 785, 000	2, 800, 000	2, 800, 000
Liquid rockets-----	30, 328, 000	63, 000, 000	63, 000, 000
Nuclear systems technology-----	6, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	10, 000, 000
Space power technology-----	4, 814, 000	8, 000, 000	8, 000, 000
Vehicle development:			
DELTA-----	13, 300, 000	12, 500, 000	12, 500, 000
CENTAUR-----	37, 000, 000	47, 000, 000	47, 000, 000
SATURN-----		134, 308, 000	134, 308, 000
Tracking and data acquisition-----	16, 266, 000	32, 550, 000	30, 922, 000
Total-----	313, 550, 000	621, 453, 000	602, 240, 000

Construction and equipment.—An appropriation of \$107,275,000 is recommended for the construction of new facilities during fiscal year 1961. This is \$33,450,000 more than the 1960 appropriation for this purpose and is a reduction of \$15,512,000 in the budget estimate. The Committee was surprised at the high square foot cost of construction for most of the buildings proposed as developed in the hearings and has made a minor reduction in each item, and the funds requested for fallout shelter construction in some of the buildings are disallowed. The \$435,300 for a publications, library, and technical services building at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory is also denied.

The Committee has allowed the essential facilities requested for the Marshall Center including the Saturn static test facility, dynamic test facility, pressure test cell, extension to assembly building, addition to engineering building, and addition to checkout building. The request for funds for a central laboratory and office facility, \$4,400,000, completion of guidance and control building, \$1,948,000, and addition to fabrication laboratory, \$215,000, are not considered as essential additions to the fine plant that is now operating satisfactorily. The Committee suggests that a greater effort be made to reach an adjustment within the maze of buildings already constructed at the facility without providing new ones for housing these needs.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

The Committee has included in the bill \$40,000 for operation and maintenance of properties in the District of Columbia under Title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act. This is the same amount as the 1960 appropriation and is a reduction of \$1,000 in the

budget estimate. The budget proposed the establishment of a revolving fund as provided in the Housing Act of 1950, subject to the approval of budgets by the Public Housing Administration, but the Committee has not approved this recommendation.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The budget estimate for the National Science Foundation for 1961 is \$190,000,000 and the Committee has approved \$160,000,000. This will provide an increase of \$7,227,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year. The Foundation has as its basic objective the support of basic scientific research and the development of trained scientific manpower. Its budget is broken down into four or five parts, including support of basic research; support of basic research facilities; fellowship grants; support of institutes for the training of teachers; and dissemination of scientific information, surveys and reports, and certain special projects in scientific education.

The amount recommended in the bill basically provides for continuing the same level of support as in the current fiscal year. An increase is recommended as follows: \$1,750,000 for the teacher institutes program; \$900,000 for fellowships; and a new item of \$300,000 for the Hawaiian Geophysical Institute. The Committee directs that the Foundation hold the entire cost of construction and equipment to a figure under \$3,000,000 for this new Institute and that the maintenance and operating cost should not be borne, as the justifications indicate, exclusively by the Federal government.

The estimates include a request for \$1,600,000 to purchase foreign currencies for a program of collecting and translating scientific information in certain foreign countries. The requested authority has been approved, but the language in the bill makes the purchase of such foreign currencies permissive for the Foundation, and within the appropriation approved.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

The budget estimate of \$2,870,000 for this Board has been approved. The only increase requested for the fiscal year 1961 is \$20,000 for the new health program.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

An appropriation of \$8,525,000 is recommended for fiscal year 1961, an increase of \$425,000 over the 1960 appropriation and a reduction of \$375,000 in the budget estimates. The amount approved will support 46 new positions which are to be used to reduce the backlog of the Division of Corporation Finance.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$30,278,400 for operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System in 1961. This is an increase of \$1,000,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year. The health program will require approximately \$380,000 of the increase and the balance is for the local draft boards. The Committee again cautions the agency not to slight the needs of the local boards.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

The Budget requested a total of \$5,397,291,000 for the Veterans Administration in 1961. The Committee is recommending \$5,322,790,000 for appropriation. This is an increase of \$280,358,000 over the current level of appropriations, and is \$74,389,000 less than the budget requests for fiscal year 1961.

General operating expenses.—The Committee has approved \$153,500,000 as contained in the revised budget estimate. This is \$9,873,000 less than the 1960 appropriation due primarily to the declining workload in the vocational rehabilitation and education, and loan guarantee programs.

Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.—The Committee recommends \$30,000,000 for appropriation in 1961, which includes \$17,000,000 for medical research. The amount provided is \$651,000 more than the funding for 1960 and is an increase of \$1,531,000 in the budget estimate. The estimates recommended reducing the medical research program from \$17,344,000 to \$15,400,000. While the amount earmarked in the bill for this purpose is \$344,000 less than the amount provided in the current year, it is in fact an increase when it is realized that certain capital equipments were procured this year which will continue to be available for use in 1961.

Inpatient care.—The Committee has approved the budget estimate of \$817,021,000 for operation of the VA hospital system. This is \$24,942,000 above the 1960 funding, and will provide for the operation of 833 new beds next year.

Outpatient care.—The Committee recommends approval of the full amount of the budget request, \$86,481,000, which is an increase of \$2,615,000 over the 1960 appropriation. Included in the request is \$219,000 to establish four audiology clinics and \$414,000 for seven day care centers for neuro-psychiatric care.

Maintenance and operation of supply depots.—The Committee has approved \$2,500,000 for this purpose, which is an increase of \$282,000 over the 1960 appropriation and a reduction of \$20,000 in the budget request.

Compensation and pensions.—Approval has been given to \$3,800,000,000 for payment of compensation and pensions to eligible veterans. This is an increase of \$500,000,000 over the appropriation for the current fiscal year. The \$40,000,000 reduction in the estimates is made on the basis that the actual requirements cannot be accurately estimated at this time.

Readjustment benefits.—The budget estimate for this purpose was reduced from \$410,000,000 to \$344,000,000 in a budget amendment. The revised amount has been approved by the Committee. It is evident that the requirements for funds will decline as the Korean conflict veterans receiving benefits complete their education.

Veterans insurance and indemnities.—The budget proposes an appropriation of \$48,800,000 which has been approved by the Committee for payment of claims under the insurance programs. The estimated requirements are \$4,200,000 less than in 1960.

Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.—The budget estimate of \$1,500,000 has been approved for medical care and treatment of eligible Philippine Commonwealth Army veterans in the Philippine Veterans Memorial Hospital in Manila, which was constructed with U.S. grants-in-aid totaling approximately \$9,400,000.

Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.—The Committee considered a budget estimate of \$75,000,000 for this construction program and is recommending an appropriation of \$39,100,000. The amount provided is \$7,441,000 more than the appropriation in 1960 and is \$35,900,000 less than the budget estimate.

It is an established policy of the Veterans Administration to locate new hospitals as close as possible to a medical center. This policy has been invaluable in providing outstanding inpatient care to veterans. While there is a great need for additional bed capacity in California, the Committee questions the wisdom of constructing a new hospital of 500 bed capacity to replace the present 742 bed hospital in northern California, particularly in view of the fact that the veteran population is growing in that area. The Committee suggests that the Veterans Administration give the matter further consideration and that a revised proposal be submitted in January. The legislative committee should make every effort to get the interested groups together to determine the best location, and the Committee will then consider the amount for appropriation.

The request for \$19,760,000 to construct a new 700 bed hospital in Washington, D.C. has been denied. The proposed construction is for too fancy a facility, and there are also other VA hospitals available to the area in all surrounding directions. The \$21,250,000 requested for the new Cleveland, Ohio, 800 bed hospital have been substantially approved, as have funds for the modernization, improvement and repair program. The Committee urges the Veterans Administration to carefully draw plans for the construction of new hospitals in its program so that good, substantial and useful buildings will be constructed, and points out that the new hospitals should not have extra and unnecessary features, but should compare favorably with those the local people build and pay for by themselves.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The subject of how much money is being spent by each agency for newspapers and periodicals, including scientific, technical, trade or traffic periodicals is one that deserves careful scrutiny. In former years the bill has contained a \$50 limitation on the amount that could be expended for such purposes unless otherwise specifically provided for, and the language of the provision has excluded scientific, technical, trade and traffic periodicals from its application. A recent decision of the Comptroller General has stated that such publications should be included within the limitation when a specific amount is provided in an appropriation item for newspapers and periodicals, which is different from the interpretation generally made by the agencies. The Committee has removed the limitations on newspapers and periodicals from the bill for this year, but the 1962 justifications for each agency should set forth in full detail all obligations for this type of expense.

Sec. 303. It has come to the Committee's attention that construction costs for public buildings are often unnecessarily increased due to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization by regulation requiring that they include fallout shelters. This may be desirable in some instances, but such a requirement should be specifically justified for each project. The bill accordingly contains a provision that no funds included in this bill shall be used for construction of fallout shelters in Government-owned or leased buildings unless they are specifically provided for.

LIMITATIONS AND LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS

The following limitations and legislative provisions not heretofore carried in connection with any appropriation bill are recommended:

On page 3, line 9, in connection with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:

, of which none shall be allocated to the States pursuant to section 205 of said Act.

On page 4, line 1, in connection with the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization:

, of which not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available to complete the two-year program of fallout shelter prototype construction.

On page 6, line 3, in connection with the Civil Service Commission:

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for printing the Official Register of the United States.

On page 9, line 1, in connection with the Federal Aviation Agency:

not to exceed \$5,000 for representation allowances and for official entertainment;

On page 12, line 10, in connection with the Federal Communications Commission:

: Provided, That not to exceed \$2,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for a special ultra-high frequency television study and shall remain available until June 30, 1962.

On page 14, line 17, in connection with the General Services Administration:

Provided, That for the purposes of this appropriation, buildings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) shall be considered to be public buildings.

On page 16, line 14, in connection with the General Services Administration:

: Provided further, That the foregoing limits of cost may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected in other projects, but not to exceed 5 per centum.

On page 19, line 14, in connection with the General Services Administration:

, with which shall be merged the unobligated balances of funds remaining available under this head on June 30, 1960:

On page 22, line 21, in connection with the General Services Administration:

Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for reimburse-

ment to the General Services Administration for those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements, performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law.

On page 27, line 14, in connection with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration:

Not to exceed \$10,000 of appropriations in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations and any emergency or extraordinary expense pursuant to section 1(f) of the legislative authorization for appropriations for the fiscal year 1961.

On page 34, line 2, in connection with the Veterans Administration:

: Provided, That certain premiums provided by law to be credited to the "Military and naval insurance" or "National service life insurance" appropriations shall hereafter be credited to appropriations granted under this head which shall be subject to the same statutory provisions and shall be available for the same purpose as formerly applied to the appropriations for "Military and naval insurance", "National service life insurance", and "Servicemen's indemnities".

On page 39, line 6, in connection with the Federal Home Loan Bank Board:

: Provided further, That hereafter expenses of the Board in making studies or investigations specifically directed by law, or requested by the Congress or either House thereof or by a committee of either House, including services authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses:

On page 41, line 3, in connection with the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation:

, and such other obligations of said corporation shall not exceed \$887,800.

On page 46, line 3, in connection with the Federal Housing Administration:

: Provided further, That nonadministrative expenses of all kinds regardless of source classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, including all appraisal fees regardless of source or method of financing shall not exceed \$50,000,000.

On page 48, line 8, in connection with General Provisions:

SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters in Government-owned or leased buildings except where specifically provided.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitations on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or agency	Authorization, 1960	Budget estimates, 1961	Recommended in bill for 1961	Bill compared with—	
				1960 authorizations	1961 estimates
Federal Home Loan Bank Board-----	(\$1,800,000)	(\$2,075,000)	(\$1,943,000)	(+\$143,000)	(--\$132,000)
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation--	(775,000)	(800,000)	(787,500)	(+12,500)	(-12,500)
General Services Administration:					
Abaca fiber program-----	(47,000)	-----	-----	(-47,000)	-----
Federal Facilities Corporation-----	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	-----	-----
Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund-----	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	-----	-----
Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
College housing loans-----	(1,723,000)	(1,400,000)	(1,260,000)	(-463,000)	(-140,000)
Public facility loans-----	(525,000)	(530,000)	(477,000)	(-48,000)	(-53,000)
Revolving fund (liquidating programs)-----	(653,000)	(155,000)	(139,500)	(-513,500)	(-15,500)
Federal National Mortgage Association-----	(6,050,000)	(6,650,000)	(6,550,000)	(+500,000)	(-100,000)
Federal Housing Administration-----	(8,100,000)	(8,800,000)	(8,450,000)	(+350,000)	(-350,000)
Public Housing Administration-----	(12,830,000)	(13,200,000)	(13,050,000)	(+220,000)	(-150,000)
Total, administrative expenses-----	(\$2,563,000)	(33,670,000)	(32,717,000)	(+154,000)	(-953,000)

PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS

Object	Appropriations, 1960	Budget estimates, 1961	Increase (+) or decrease (—) estimates compared with appropriations
Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Power Act.-----	\$57, 000	\$61, 000	+ \$4, 000
General Services Administration: Expenses, disposal of surplus real and related personal property.-----	1, 400, 000	2, 000, 000	+ 600, 000
Total, permanent and indefinite appropriations-----	1, 457, 000	2, 061, 000	+ 604, 000

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1960 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED
IN BILL FOR 1961

Item	Appropriations, 1960	Budget estimates, 1961	Recommended in bill for 1961	Bill compared with—	
				1960 appropriations	1961 estimates
TITLE I					
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$29, 535, 000	\$25, 750, 000	\$24, 700, 000	—\$4, 835, 000	—\$1, 050, 000
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.....	-----	10, 000, 000	6, 250, 000	+6, 250, 000	—3, 750, 000
Federal contributions.....	10, 000, 000	22, 000, 000	10, 000, 000	-----	—12, 000, 000
Emergency supplies and equipment.....	6, 950, 000	11, 400, 000	6, 950, 000	-----	—4, 450, 000
Research and development.....	4, 000, 000	7, 200, 000	4, 000, 000	-----	—3, 200, 000
Construction of facilities.....	2, 400, 000	-----	-----	—2, 400, 000	-----
Total, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.....	52, 885, 000	76, 350, 000	51, 900, 000	—985, 000	—24, 450, 000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD					
Salaries and expenses.....	6, 925, 000	7, 600, 000	7, 285, 000	+360, 000	—315, 000
Payments to air carriers (liquidation of contract authorization).....	58, 500, 000	68, 984, 000	60, 000, 000	+1, 500, 000	—8, 984, 000
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board.....	65, 425, 000	76, 584, 000	67, 285, 000	+1, 860, 000	—9, 299, 000

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses-----	19, 120, 000	20, 030, 000	19, 230, 000	+ 110, 000	- 800, 000
Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations-----	400, 000	467, 000	400, 000	-----	- 67, 000
Annuities under special acts-----	2, 450, 000	2, 316, 000	2, 316, 000	- 134, 000	-----
Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund-----	-----	2, 500, 000	2, 500, 000	+ 2, 500, 000	-----
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund-----	-----	46, 329, 000	46, 329, 000	+ 46, 329, 000	-----
Administrative expenses, Employees' Life Insurance Fund (limitation)-----	(249, 000)	(250, 000)	(250, 000)	(+ 1, 000)	-----
Total, Civil Service Commission-----	21, 970, 000	71, 642, 000	70, 775, 000	+ 48, 805, 000	- 867, 000
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY					
Expenses-----	301, 700, 000	383, 000, 000	365, 245, 000	+ 63, 545, 000	- 17, 755, 000
Establishment of air navigation facilities-----	135, 200, 000	174, 000, 000	152, 500, 000	+ 17, 300, 000	- 21, 500, 000
Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization)-----	47, 500, 000	80, 000, 000	80, 000, 000	+ 32, 500, 000	-----
Research and development-----	48, 725, 000	65, 000, 000	64, 000, 000	+ 15, 275, 000	- 1, 000, 000
Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports-----	-----	6, 000, 000	-----	-----	- 6, 000, 000
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport-----	2, 400, 000	-----	3, 230, 000	+ 830, 000	+ 3, 230, 000
Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport-----	-----	-----	2, 450, 000	+ 2, 450, 000	+ 2, 450, 000
Construction, Washington National Airport-----	-----	5, 000, 000	4, 500, 000	+ 4, 500, 000	- 500, 000
Construction and development, additional Washington Airport-----	22, 470, 000	-----	-----	- 22, 470, 000	-----
Total, Federal Aviation Agency-----	557, 995, 000	713, 000, 000	671, 925, 000	+ 113, 930, 000	- 41, 075, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 29.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1960 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1961—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1960	Budget estimates, 1961	Recommended in bill for 1961	Bill compared with—	
				1960 appropriations	1961 estimates
TITLE I—Continued					
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued					
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$10, 550, 000	\$13, 500, 000	\$12, 935, 000	+\$2, 385, 000	—\$565, 000
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	7, 218, 000	7, 795, 000	7, 532, 000	+314, 000	—263, 000
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	6, 840, 000	7, 600, 000	7, 415, 000	+575, 000	—185, 000
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses.....	41, 800, 000	41, 150, 000	41, 150, 000	—650, 000	-----
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service.....	151, 000, 000	170, 500, 000	160, 850, 000	+9, 850, 000	—9, 650, 000
Repair and improvement of public buildings.....	60, 000, 000	60, 000, 000	58, 000, 000	—2, 000, 000	—2, 000, 000
Construction and acquisition of public buildings.....	-----	185, 000, 000	-----	-----	—185, 000, 000
Construction, public buildings projects.....	-----	-----	144, 836, 000	+144, 836, 000	+144, 836, 000
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects.....	25, 000, 000	-----	25, 000, 000	-----	+25, 000, 000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts.....	1, 675, 000	4, 630, 000	4, 000, 000	+2, 325, 000	—630, 000

Construction of relocation facilities-----	3, 800, 000				-3, 800, 000
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service-----	3, 770, 000	3, 716, 500	-53, 500		-523, 500
<i>Indefinite appropriation of receipts</i> -----	(2, 230, 000)	(3, 243, 500)	(+1, 013, 500)		(-16, 500)
Expenses, supply distribution-----	21, 450, 000	22, 950, 000	+1, 500, 000		-350, 000
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service-----	9, 176, 800	9, 420, 000	+243, 200		-180, 000
Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service-----	2, 000, 000	2, 375, 000	+375, 000		-25, 000
Strategic and critical materials-----		30, 000, 000	+30, 000, 000		-9, 132, 000
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator-----	225, 000	240, 000	+15, 000		-----
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents-----	200, 000	250, 000	+50, 000		-----
Refunds under Renegotiation Act-----		900, 000	+900, 000		-----
Administrative operations fund (limitation)-----	(12, 750, 000)	(13, 000, 000)	(+250, 000)		(-300, 000)
Total, General Services Administration-----	274, 496, 800	462, 537, 500	+188, 040, 700		-41, 454, 500
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY					
Office of the Administrator:					
Salaries and expenses-----	9, 342, 000	10, 327, 000	+985, 000		-310, 000
Urban planning grants-----	1, 725, 000	4, 000, 000	+2, 275, 000		-750, 000
Reserve of planned public works (payment to revolving fund)-----	6, 000, 000	6, 000, 000			-1, 000, 000

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1960 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1961—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1960	Budget estimates, 1961	Recommended in bill for 1961	Bill compared with—	
				1960 appropriations	1961 estimates
TITLE I—Continued					
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued					
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY—Continued					
Office of the Administrator—Continued					
Grants for slum clearance and urban renewal-----	\$90,000,000	\$150,000,000	\$150,000,000	+\$60,000,000	-----
Housing for the elderly (payment to revolving fund)-----			5,000,000	+5,000,000	+\$5,000,000
Housing studies (liquidation of contract authoriza- tion)-----		600,000		-----	--600,000
Total, Office of the Administrator-----	107,067,000	172,987,000	175,327,000	+68,260,000	+2,340,000
Public Housing Administration:					
Annual contributions-----	120,000,000	146,000,000	140,000,000	+20,000,000	--6,000,000
Administrative expenses-----	12,830,000	13,200,000	13,050,000	+220,000	--150,000
Total, Public Housing Administration-----	132,830,000	159,200,000	153,050,000	+20,220,000	--6,150,000
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency-----	239,897,000	332,187,000	328,377,000	+88,480,000	--3,810,000
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses-----	19,650,000	20,500,000	19,777,000	+127,000	--723,000

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses-----	91, 400, 000	² 170, 760, 000	166, 500, 000	+ 75, 100, 000	- 4, 260, 000
Research and development-----	335, 350, 000	³ 621, 453, 000	602, 240, 000	+ 266, 890, 000	- 19, 213, 000
Construction and equipment-----	73, 825, 000	⁴ 122, 787, 000	107, 275, 000	+ 33, 450, 000	- 15, 512, 000
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration-----	500, 575, 000	915, 000, 000	876, 015, 000	+ 375, 440, 000	- 38, 985, 000
NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY					
Operation and maintenance of properties-----	40, 000	41, 000	40, 000	-----	- 1, 000
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION					
Salaries and expenses-----	152, 773, 000	190, 000, 000	160, 000, 000	+ 7, 227, 000	- 30, 000, 000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program)-----	-----	1, 600, 000	-----	-----	- 1, 600, 000
Total, National Science Foundation-----	152, 773, 000	191, 600, 000	160, 000, 000	+ 7, 227, 000	- 31, 600, 000
RENEGOTIATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses-----	2, 850, 000	2, 870, 000	2, 870, 000	+ 20, 000	-----
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses-----	8, 100, 000	8, 900, 000	8, 525, 000	+ 425, 000	- 375, 000
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM					
Salaries and expenses-----	29, 278, 400	32, 950, 000	30, 278, 400	+ 1, 000, 000	- 2, 671, 600

See footnotes at end of table, p. 29.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1960 and estimates and amounts recommended in the bill for 1961—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1960	Budget estimates, 1961	Recommended in bill for 1961	Bill compared with—	
				1960 appropriations	1961 estimates
TITLE I—Continued					
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued					
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION					
General operating expenses.....	\$163, 373, 000	\$153, 500, 000	\$153, 500, 000	—\$9, 873, 000	-----
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	29, 349, 000	28, 469, 000	30, 000, 000	+ 651, 000	+ \$1, 531, 000
Inpatient care.....	792, 079, 000	817, 021, 000	817, 021, 000	+ 24, 942, 000	-----
Outpatient care.....	83, 866, 000	86, 481, 000	86, 481, 000	+ 2, 615, 000	-----
Maintenance and operation of supply depots.....	2, 218, 000	2, 520, 000	2, 500, 000	+ 282, 000	—20, 000
Compensation and pensions.....	3, 300, 000, 000	3, 840, 000, 000	3, 800, 000, 000	+ 500, 000, 000	—40, 000, 000
Readjustment benefits.....	585, 000, 000	344, 000, 000	344, 000, 000	—241, 000, 000	-----
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	53, 000, 000	48, 800, 000	48, 800, 000	—4, 200, 000	-----
<i>Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....</i>	<i>(690, 000)</i>	<i>(685, 000)</i>	<i>(685, 000)</i>	<i>(—5, 000)</i>	-----
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	2, 000, 000	1, 500, 000	1, 500, 000	—500, 000	-----

Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities-----	31, 659, 000	75, 000, 000	39, 100, 000	+ 7, 441, 000	- 35, 900, 000
Total, Veterans' Administration-----	5, 042, 544, 000	5, 397, 291, 000	5, 322, 902, 000	+ 280, 358, 000	- 74, 389, 000
Total, definite appropriations-----	7, 034, 887, 200	8, 412, 952, 000	8, 142, 238, 900	+ 1, 107, 351, 700	- 270, 713, 100
Total, indefinite appropriations-----	2, 920, 000	3, 945, 000	3, 928, 500	+ 1, 008, 500	- 16, 500
Total, title I-----	7, 037, 807, 200	8, 416, 897, 000	8, 146, 167, 400	+ 1, 108, 360, 200	- 270, 729, 600

- ¹ Estimate decreased \$21,000,000 in H. Doc. 371.
² Includes \$3,200,000 contained in H. Doc. 329.
³ Includes \$76,300,000 contained in H. Doc. 329.
⁴ Includes \$33,500,000 contained in H. Doc. 329.
⁵ Estimate decreased \$554,000 in H. Doc. 328.
⁶ Estimate decreased \$66,000,000 in H. Doc. 328.

Union Calendar No. 653

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11776

[Report No. 1519]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APRIL 14, 1960

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the following bill; which was committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

A BILL

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senute and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry
5 independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, cor-
6 porations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending
7 June 30, 1961, namely:

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE

MOBILIZATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; and not to exceed \$900,000 for expenses of travel; \$24,700,000, of which \$185,000 shall be available for the Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Committee: *Provided*, That one contract for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), for not to exceed one person, may be renewed annually at a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS

OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

For expenses necessary to enable other Federal agencies to perform such civil defense and defense mobilization functions as may be designated by the Office of Civil and Defense

1 Mobilization, including payments by the Department of
2 Labor to State employment security agencies for the full cost
3 of administration of defense manpower mobilization activi-
4 ties, \$6,250,000.

5 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

6 For financial contributions to the States for civil defense
7 purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,
8 as amended, to be equally matched with State funds,
9 \$10,000,000, of which none shall be allocated to the States
10 pursuant to section 205 of said Act.

11 EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

12 For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing,
13 distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense
14 materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of
15 the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended,
16 \$6,950,000.

17 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

18 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
19 studies and research to develop measures and plans for
20 evacuation, shelter, and the protection of life and property,
21 as authorized by section 201 (d) of the Federal Civil Defense
22 Act of 1950, as amended, including services as authorized
23 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),

1 \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which
2 not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available to complete the
3 two-year program of fallout shelter prototype construction.

4 No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be avail-
5 able for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of
6 warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed
7 specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense
8 Mobilization.

9 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

10 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board,
13 including contract stenographic reporting services; employ-
14 ment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; hire,
15 operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; purchase
16 (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor
17 vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
18 of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals
19 not to exceed \$50 per diem; \$7,285,000.

20 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT 21 AUTHORIZATION)

22 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compen-
23 sation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board
24 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958

1 (49 U.S.C. 1376) , as is payable by the Board, \$60,000,000,
2 to remain available until expended.

3 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$22;-
6 000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
7 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; not to exceed \$10,000
8 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private
9 physicians on a fee basis; payment in advance for library
10 membership in societies whose publications are available to
11 members only or to members at a price lower than to the
12 general public; not to exceed \$77,000 for performing the
13 duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19,
14 1940 (54 Stat. 767) ; reimbursement of the General Services
15 Administration for security guard services for protection of
16 confidential files; and not to exceed \$5,000 for actuarial
17 services by contract, without regard to section 3709, Revised
18 Statutes, as amended; \$19,230,000: *Provided*, That no part
19 of this appropriation shall be available for the Career Ex-
20 ecutive Board established by Executive Order 10758 of
21 March 4, 1958, as amended.

22 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
23 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and
24 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and

1 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established
2 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

3 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
4 Service Commission shall be available for printing the Official
5 Register of the United States.

6 INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EM-
7 PLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

8 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
9 Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended,
10 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary
11 General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of
12 other international organizations, certain information con-
13 cerning United States citizens employed, or being considered
14 for employment by such organizations, including services as
15 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
16 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$400,000: *Provided*, That this appro-
17 priation shall be available for advances or reimbursements
18 to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil
19 Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation
20 for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive
21 order: *Provided further*, That members of the International
22 Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual
23 transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence
24 authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended,

1 while traveling on official business away from their homes
2 or regular places of business, including periods while en route
3 to and from and at the place where their services are to be
4 performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in sections 281
5 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of
6 the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed to apply
7 to any person because of appointment for part-time or in-
8 termittent service as a member of the International Organiza-
9 tions Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Commis-
10 sion as established by Executive Order 10422, dated January
11 9, 1953, as amended.

12 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

13 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May
14 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of
15 August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775),
16 \$2,316,000.

17 GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES

18 HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

19 For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund" of
20 Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as
21 authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health
22 Benefits Act (73 Stat. 713), \$2,500,000, to remain avail-
23 able until expended.

1 PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DIS-
2 ABILITY FUND

3 For financing the annuity benefits and increases, during
4 the current fiscal year, provided by the Act of June 25,
5 1958 (72 Stat. 218), \$46,329,000, to be credited to the
6 civil service retirement and disability fund.

7 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES
8 LIFE INSURANCE FUND

9 Not to exceed \$250,000 of the funds in the "Em-
10 ployees' Life Insurance Fund" shall be available for
11 reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for ad-
12 ministrative expenses incurred by the Commission during
13 the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal
14 Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended
15 (5 U.S.C. 2091-2103): *Provided*, That this limitation
16 shall include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act,
17 notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law
18 85-377 (5 U.S.C. 2094 (c)).

19 FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY
20 EXPENSES

21 For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency,
22 not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses
23 for research and development and for establishment of air
24 navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the
25 Federal Airport Act; purchase of twenty passenger motor

1 vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed \$5,000 for
2 representation allowances and for official entertainment; and
3 purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; \$365,245,000:
4 *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation,
5 funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other
6 public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred
7 in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

8 ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

9 For an additional amount for the acquisition, establish-
10 ment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of
11 air navigation facilities, including the initial acquisition of
12 necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and fur-
13 nishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers
14 and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at
15 remote localities where such accommodations are not avail-
16 able (at a total cost of construction of not to exceed \$50,000
17 per housing unit in Alaska) ; purchase of five aircraft; and
18 the initial flight checking of air navigation facilities and the
19 transportation by air to and from and within Alaska and the
20 Territories of the United States of materials and equipment
21 secured under this appropriation; \$152,500,000, to remain
22 available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be
23 credited to this appropriation funds received from States,

1 counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private
2 sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air
3 navigation facilities.

4 GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF
5 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

6 For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority
7 granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to
8 enter into contracts, \$80,000,000, to remain available until
9 expended.

10 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

11 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
12 research, development, and service testing, including con-
13 struction of experimental facilities and acquisition of neces-
14 sary sites by lease or grant, \$64,000,000, to remain available
15 until expended.

16 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL
17 AIRPORT

18 For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-
19 nance, improvement and protection of the Washington
20 National Airport, including purchase of one passenger motor
21 vehicle, for replacement only, for police-type use which may
22 exceed by \$300 the general purchase price limitation for
23 the current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of
24 uniforms; and arms and ammunition; \$3,230,000.

1 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES INTERNATIONAL

2 AIRPORT

3 For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-
4 nance, improvement and protection of the Dulles Interna-
5 tional Airport, including purchase of four passenger motor
6 vehicles, of which three for police-type use may exceed by
7 \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the
8 current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of uni-
9 forms; and arms and ammunition; \$2,450,000.

10 CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

11 For necessary expenses for construction at Washington
12 National Airport, including acquisition of land, \$4,500,000,
13 to remain available until expended.

14 GENERAL PROVISION

15 During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations
16 to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the
17 Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified
18 in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C.
19 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Admin-
20 istrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance and
21 operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and
22 aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized
23 by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C.
24 2131).

1 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the
4 Commission as authorized by law, including land and struc-
5 tures (not to exceed \$23,000), special counsel fees, im-
6 provement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not
7 to exceed \$14,600), services as authorized by section 15 of
8 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and purchase
9 of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replace-
10 ment only, \$12,935,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed
11 \$2,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for a
12 special ultra-high frequency television study and shall remain
13 available until June 30, 1962.

14 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission,
17 as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor
18 vehicles, \$7,532,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be
19 available for special counsel and services as authorized by
20 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
21 but at rates not exceeding \$50 per diem for individuals.

22 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

23 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

24 For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commis-
25 sion, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as author-

1 ized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by
2 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
3 \$7,415,000: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appro-
4 priation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter
5 provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds
6 are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such reso-
7 lution to finance the cost of such investigation.

8 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office,
11 including rental or lease of office space in foreign countries
12 without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the
13 Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and serv-
14 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
15 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$41,150,000.

16 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

17 OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

18 For necessary expenses of real property management
19 and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings
20 in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises;
21 moving Government agencies (including space adjustments)
22 in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer
23 of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and
24 disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests
25 therein; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of

1 August 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521) ; \$160,850,000: *Pro-*
2 *vided*, That this appropriation shall be available, without
3 regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as
4 amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to buildings, or
5 parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appropriation for
6 “Emergency operating expenses”.

7 REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

8 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
9 alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pur-
10 suant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479),
11 including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves
12 and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent
13 thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites acquired for public
14 buildings; preliminary planning of projects by contract or
15 otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equip-
16 ment; \$58,000,000, to remain available until expended:
17 *Provided*, That for the purposes of this appropriation, build-
18 ings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase
19 Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) shall be considered
20 to be public buildings.

21 CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

22 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
23 construct public buildings projects and alter public build-
24 ings by extension or conversion where the estimated cost for
25 a project is in excess of \$200,000 pursuant to the Public

1 Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), including equipment
2 for such buildings, \$144,836,000, to remain available until
3 expended: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be
4 available for public buildings projects at locations and at
5 maximum construction improvement costs (excluding funds
6 for sites and expenses) as follows:

7 Post office and Federal office building, Camden, Arkan-
8 sas, \$633,250;

9 Courthouse and Federal office building, San Francisco,
10 California, \$37,286,100;

11 Courthouse and Federal office building, Hartford, Con-
12 necticut, \$7,636,400;

13 Federal office building, Miami, Florida, \$7,076,250;

14 Post office and courthouse, Thomasville, Georgia,
15 \$1,094,000;

16 Border station, Jackman, Maine, \$289,850;

17 Border station, Van Buren, Maine, \$284,750;

18 Border station, Vanceboro, Maine, \$254,150;

19 Immigration and Naturalization Service center, (con-
20 struction and alteration) Detroit, Michigan, \$874,650;

21 Border station, Sweetgrass, Montana, \$586,500;

22 General Services Administration stores depot annex,
23 Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$469,200;

24 Post office and courthouse, Bismarck, North Dakota,
25 \$3,224,050;

1 Federal office building, Toledo, Ohio, \$3,867,700;

2 Post office and courthouse (construction and alteration),
3 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$5,601,500;

4 Courthouse and Federal office building, Memphis, Ten-
5 nessee, \$9,587,150;

6 Border station, El Paso, Texas, \$1,055,700;

7 Post office and Federal office building, Dayton, Wash-
8 ington, \$282,200;

9 Federal Office Building Numbered Nine, District of Co-
10 lumbia, \$20,031,100;

11 Federal Office Building Numbered Ten, District of Co-
12 lumbia, \$38,326,500; and

13 United States Court of Claims and Court of Customs and
14 Patent Appeals building, \$6,375,000: *Provided further,*
15 That the foregoing limits of costs may be exceeded to the
16 extent that savings are effected in other projects, but by not
17 to exceed 5 per centum.

18 SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

19 For an additional amount for expenses necessary in con-
20 nection with the construction of public buildings projects
21 not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in
22 the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and
23 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings

1 projects by contract or otherwise, \$25,000,000, to remain
2 available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed
3 \$5,500,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used for
4 clearing the site and installing footings for the authorized
5 public building project at Chicago, Illinois.

6 PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

7 For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other
8 obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the
9 Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C.
10 356), \$4,000,000.

11 OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

12 For necessary expenses of personal property manage-
13 ment and related activities as authorized by law and not
14 otherwise provided for, \$3,716,500: *Provided*, That not to
15 exceed \$3,243,500 of any funds received during the current
16 or preceding fiscal year for deposit under section 204 (a) of
17 the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of
18 1949, as amended, and not otherwise disposed of by law,
19 shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and
20 shall be available for necessary expenses in carrying out the
21 functions of the General Services Administration under the
22 said Act, with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess
23 and surplus personal property.

1 EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

2 For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for
3 operation of the stores depot system and other procurement
4 services, including contractual services incident to receiv-
5 ing, handling, and shipping warehouse items, \$22,950,000.

6 OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND

7 RECORDS SERVICE

8 For necessary expenses in connection with Federal rec-
9 ords management and related activities as provided by law,
10 including reimbursement for security guard services, and
11 contractual services incident to movement or disposal of
12 records, \$9,420,000.

13 OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC

14 UTILITIES SERVICE

15 For necessary expenses of transportation and public
16 utilities management and related activities, as provided by
17 law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the
18 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to
19 exceed \$75 per diem for individuals, \$2,375,000.

20 STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

21 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions
22 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50
23 U.S.C. 98-98b), during the current fiscal year, for trans-

1 portation and handling, within the United States (including
2 charges at United States ports), storage, security, and main-
3 tenance of strategic and critical materials acquired for or
4 transferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant
5 to section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development
6 and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704 (b)), for carry-
7 ing out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act
8 of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462), relating to machine tools
9 and industrial manufacturing equipment for which the Gen-
10 eral Services Administration is responsible, including
11 reimbursement for security guard services, services as au-
12 thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
13 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed \$2,948,000 for operating
14 expenses, \$30,000,000, with which shall be merged the
15 unobligated balances of funds remaining available under this
16 head on June 30, 1960: *Provided*, That no part of funds
17 available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank
18 storage facilities: *Provided further*, That any receipts from
19 sales or otherwise during the current fiscal year shall be
20 promptly deposited into the Treasury.

21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

22 For expenses of executive direction for activities under
23 the control of the General Services Administration, \$240,000.

1 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER
2 PRESIDENTS

3 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August
4 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$250,000: *Provided*, That the
5 Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Sec-
6 retary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to
7 carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such
8 Act.

9 REFUNDS UNDER RENEGOTIATION ACT

10 For refunds under section 201 (f) of the Renegotiation
11 Act of 1951 (50 U.S.C. App. 1231 (f)), \$900,000, to
12 remain available until expended.

13 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

14 Funds available to General Services Administration for
15 administrative operations, in support of program activities,
16 shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a
17 single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That
18 costs and obligations for such administrative operations for
19 the respective program activities shall be accounted for in
20 accordance with systems approved by the General Account-
21 ing Office: *Provided further*, That the total amount deposited
22 into said account for the fiscal year 1961 from funds made
23 available to General Services Administration in this Act
24 shall not exceed \$13,000,000: *Provided further*, That
25 amounts deposited into said account for administrative oper-

1 ations for each program shall not exceed the amounts in-
2 cluded in the respective program appropriations for such
3 purposes.

4 GENERAL PROVISIONS

5 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the
6 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)
7 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,
8 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from
9 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129) ;
10 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to
11 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the
12 General Services Administration, issued by public author-
13 ities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in
14 respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator
15 deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the
16 request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be pro-
17 vided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and
18 (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and
19 transferred to the General Services Administration, in con-
20 nection with property transferred to the General Services
21 Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50
22 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so
23 transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.
24 Appropriations under the head "Construction, Public
25 Buildings Projects" shall be available for acquisition of

1 buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation or
2 otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, or
3 for other approved extension and conversion projects outside
4 the District of Columbia.

5 Funds available to the General Services Administration
6 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

7 No part of any money appropriated by this or any other
8 Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Govern-
9 ment shall be used during the current fiscal year for the pur-
10 chase within the continental limits of the United States of
11 any typewriting machines except in accordance with regula-
12 tions issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Prop-
13 erty and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

14 Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made
15 available to the General Services Administration for the cur-
16 rent fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other
17 such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be in-
18 creased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided*, That
19 such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and
20 shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$2,000,000.

21 Appropriations available to any department or agency
22 during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, in-
23 cluding maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be
24 available for reimbursement to the General Services Admin-
25 istration for those expenses of renovation and alteration of

1 buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements,
2 performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of
3 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law.

4 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

5 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administra-
8 tor, including rent in the District of Columbia; services as
9 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
10 U.S.C. 55a) ; and purchase of two passenger motor vehicles
11 for replacement only; \$10,327,000: *Provided*, That neces-
12 sary expenses of inspections and of providing repre-
13 sentatives at the site of projects being planned or under-
14 taken by local public agencies pursuant to title I of the
15 Housing Act of 1949, as amended, projects financed through
16 loans to educational institutions authorized by title IV of the
17 Housing Act of 1950, as amended, and projects and facilities
18 financed by loans to public agencies pursuant to title II of
19 the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be
20 compensated by such agencies or institutions by the payment
21 of fixed fees which in the aggregate will cover the costs of
22 rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose shall
23 be considered nonadministrative; and for the purpose of pro-

viding such inspections, the Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such institutions, or the Administrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such charges have been made, but such nonadministrative expenses shall not exceed \$2,900,000.

URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

For grants in accordance with the provisions of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, \$4,000,000.

RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS (PAYMENT TO REVOLVING FUND)

For payment to the revolving fund established pursuant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C. 462), \$6,000,000.

GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

For an additional amount for payment of grants as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), \$150,000,000.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY (PAYMENT TO REVOLVING FUND)

For payment to the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, \$5,000,000.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410), \$140,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, \$13,050,000, to be expended under the authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this Act.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including not to exceed \$5,000 for the employment of special counsel; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals; and purchase of not to exceed thirty-three passenger motor vehicles of which twenty-seven shall be for replacement only; \$19,777,000, of which not less than \$1,567,000 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not

1 less than \$1,094,500 shall be available for expenses neces-
2 sary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Provided*,
3 That Joint Board members and cooperating State commis-
4 sioners may use Government transportation requests when
5 traveling in connection with their duties as such.

6 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

7 ADMINISTRATION

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of
10 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, includ-
11 ing hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$4,900,-
12 000 for expenses of travel; and uniforms or allowances there-
13 for, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as
14 amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; \$166,500,000.

15 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

16 For contractual research, development, operations, tech-
17 nical services, repairs, alterations, and minor construction,
18 and for supplies, materials, and equipment necessary for the
19 conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and
20 development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space
21 Administration; and purchase of forty-five passenger motor
22 vehicles, of which twenty-nine shall be for replacement only;
23 \$602,240,000, to remain available until expended: *Pro-*
24 *vided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available

1 for payment of salaries of National Aeronautics and Space
2 Administration personnel.

3 CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

4 For construction and equipment for the National Aero-
5 nautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or
6 condemnation of real property as authorized by law, \$107,-
7 275,000, to remain available until expended.

8 GENERAL PROVISIONS

9 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made
10 available to the National Aeronautics and Space Adminis-
11 tration by this Act may be transferred to any other such
12 appropriation, but the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation
13 shall not be thereby increased.

14 Not to exceed \$10,000 of appropriations in this Act
15 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall
16 be available for scientific consultations and any emergency or
17 extraordinary expense pursuant to section 1 (f) of the
18 legislative authorization for appropriations for the fiscal year
19 1961.

20 NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

21 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

22 For the operation and maintenance of properties under
23 title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, \$40,-
24 000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases,
25 or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the

1 United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so long as
2 funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing
3 purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act
4 of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not
5 be effective.

6 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
9 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42
10 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including award of graduate fellow-
11 ships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
12 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50
13 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
14 and reimbursement of the General Services Administration
15 for security guard services; \$160,000,000, to remain avail-
16 able until expended: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount
17 not less than \$30,250,000 shall be available for tuition,
18 grants, and allowances in connection with a program of sup-
19plementary training for secondary school science and mathe-
20 matics teachers: *Provided further*, That not to exceed
21 \$1,600,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used to
22 purchase foreign currencies which accrue under title
23 I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance
24 Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the pur-
25 poses authorized by section 104 (k) of that Act.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals, \$2,870,000.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$8,525,000.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase of eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including one at not to exceed \$4,000; not to exceed \$61,536 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board; and \$19,140 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists;

1 \$30,278,400: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year,
2 the President may exempt this appropriation from the pro-
3 visions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised
4 Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be
5 necessary in the interest of national defense.

6 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

7 GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

8 For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad-
9 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses
10 incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uni-
11 forms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; reim-
12 bursement of the General Services Administration for secu-
13 rity guard service; and not to exceed \$67,000 for preparation,
14 shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic
15 displays, moving pictures, and other visual education infor-
16 mation and descriptive material, including purchase or
17 rental of equipment; \$153,500,000: *Provided*, That no part
18 of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-
19 two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided fur-*
20 *ther*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay
21 educational institutions for reports and certifications of at-
22 tendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess
23 of \$1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and
24 attending such institution.

1 MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS

2 OPERATING EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary for administration of the medical,
4 hospital, domiciliary, special service, construction and supply,
5 research, and employee education and training activities, and
6 expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical re-
7 search, as authorized by law, \$30,000,000, of which \$17,-
8 000,000 shall be available for medical research: *Provided*,
9 That \$1,000,000 of the foregoing appropriations shall re-
10 main available until expended for prosthetic testing and
11 development.

12 INPATIENT CARE

13 For expenses necessary for the maintenance and opera-
14 tion of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and for the care
15 and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration
16 in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Admin-
17 istration as authorized by law, including the furnishing of
18 recreational articles and facilities; maintenance and operation
19 of farms; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities
20 in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of
21 the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either
22 by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and pur-
23 chase of materials; purchase of ninety-four passenger
24 motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allow-

ances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 11, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; and aid to State or Territorial homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38, United States Code, for the support of veterans eligible for admission to Veterans Administration facilities for hospital or domiciliary care; \$817,021,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That allotments and transfers may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

OUTPATIENT CARE

For expenses necessary for furnishing outpatient care to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, as authorized by law; purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; \$86,481,000.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF SUPPLY DEPOTS

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of supply depots, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), \$2,500,000.

1 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

2 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,
3 and allowances (including burial awards authorized by sec-
4 tion 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence
5 allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under
6 any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based
7 thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and
8 annuities, the administration of which is now or may here-
9 after be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the
10 payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections
11 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended,
12 \$3,800,000,000, to remain available until expended.

13 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

14 For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans
15 as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment
16 Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and
17 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equip-
18 ment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38,
19 United States Code, \$344,000,000, to remain available
20 until expended.

21 VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

22 For military and naval insurance, for national service
23 life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-

1 disabled veterans insurance, \$48,800,000, to remain avail-
2 able until expended: *Provided*, That certain premiums pro-
3 vided by law to be credited to the "Military and naval
4 insurance" or "National service life insurance" appropria-
5 tions shall hereafter be credited to appropriations granted
6 under this head which shall be subject to the same statutory
7 provisions and shall be available for the same purpose as
8 formerly applied to the appropriations for "Military and naval
9 insurance", "National service life insurance", and "Service-
10 men's indemnities".

11 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

12 For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants
13 in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United
14 States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treat-
15 ment of veterans, \$1,500,000.

16 CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY
17 FACILITIES

18 For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and
19 for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and ex-
20 tending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the
21 Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth
22 in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States
23 Code, \$39,100,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appropriations so augmented.

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for "Inpatient care" and "Outpatient care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code), for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under such appropriations.

No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Veterans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

1 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-
2 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons except
3 beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits
4 to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the
5 appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Adminis-
6 trator of Veterans Affairs.

7 INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

8 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are ex-
9 pendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific
10 limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such
11 travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth there-
12 for in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations:
13 *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel per-
14 formed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal
15 boards of the Selective Service System, or to travel per-
16 formed in connection with the investigation of aircraft acci-
17 dents by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

18 SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this
19 title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling
20 a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held
21 by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of
22 the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period
23 of active military or naval service and has within

1 ninety days after his release from such service or from hospi-
2 talization continuing after discharge for a period of not more
3 than one year made application for restoration to his former
4 position and has been certified by the Civil Service Commis-
5 sion as still qualified to perform the duties of his former posi-
6 tion and has not been restored thereto.

7 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available
8 by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase
9 or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new of-
10 fices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this
11 limitation shall not apply to programs which have been ap-
12 proved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

13 TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

14 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,
15 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the
16 limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each
17 such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to
18 make such contracts and commitments without regard to
19 fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the
20 Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may
21 be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the
22 Budget for the fiscal year 1961 for each such corporation
23 or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

1 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

2 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXAMINATION

3 EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

4 Not to exceed a total of \$1,943,000 shall be avail-
5 able for administrative expenses of the Federal Home
6 Loan Bank Board, and shall be derived from funds available
7 to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in
8 the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and
9 receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration,
10 the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home Loan
11 Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years,
12 and the Board may utilize and may make payment for
13 services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the
14 Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insur-
15 ance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government
16 (including payment for office space) : *Provided*, That all
17 necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship
18 of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan
19 Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of pro-
20 ceedings under section 5 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan
21 Act of 1933 or section 407 of the National Housing Act and
22 all necessary expenses (including services performed on a
23 contract or fee basis, but not including other personal serv-
24 ices) in connection with the handling, including the pur-

1 chase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal
2 home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of,
3 or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the
4 Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-
5 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes here-
6 of: *Provided further*, That hereafter expenses of the Board
7 in making studies or investigations specifically directed by
8 law, or requested by the Congress or either House thereof or
9 by a committee of either House, including services authorized
10 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
11 shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses: *Provided*
12 *further*, That members and alternates of the Federal Savings
13 and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reimburse-
14 ment from the Board as approved by the Board for trans-
15 portation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of or
16 concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid
17 not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided*
18 *further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this
19 Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore speci-
20 fied, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the
21 Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance
22 with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of
23 July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449): *Pro-*
24 *vided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses for the

1 examination of Federal and State chartered institutions
2 (other than special examinations determined by the Board
3 to be necessary) shall not exceed \$8,141,000.

4 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
5 SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

6 Not to exceed \$787,500 shall be available for ad-
7 ministrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual
8 basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation,
9 properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection
10 with liquidation of insured institutions or preparation for
11 or conduct of proceedings under section 407 of the National
12 Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived
13 from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action
14 for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of
15 losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and ex-
16 penses, and payments for administrative expenses of the
17 Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board
18 to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said
19 Corporation may utilize and may make payment for services
20 and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal
21 Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and
22 other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwith-
23 standing any other provisions of this Act, except for the
24 limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administra-
25 tive expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall

1 be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV
2 of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724–
3 1730), and such other obligations of said corporation shall
4 not exceed \$887,800.

5 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

6 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL

7 FACILITIES CORPORATION

8 Not to exceed \$20,000 shall be available during the
9 fiscal year 1961 for all administrative expenses of the
10 Corporation (including use of the services and facilities
11 of Federal Reserve banks), to be computed on an accrual
12 basis, and to be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, cap-
13 italized expenditures, expenses in connection with the
14 acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improve-
15 ment, or disposition of real or personal property belonging
16 to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, expenses
17 of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection
18 with the performance of legal services, and all administrative
19 expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies.

20 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECON-

21 STRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION

22 FUND

23 Not to exceed \$40,000 (to be computed on an accrual
24 basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of
25 Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General

1 Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1
2 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the cur-
3 rent fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the
4 liquidation of said functions: *Provided*, That as used herein
5 the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to
6 include all salaries and wages, services performed on a con-
7 tract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including
8 the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative
9 offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of services
10 performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the
11 termination of contracts or in the performance of legal
12 services: *Provided further*, That the distribution of adminis-
13 trative expenses to the account shall be made in accordance
14 with generally recognized accounting principles and prac-
15 tices.

16 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

17 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
18 THE ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

19 Not to exceed \$1,260,000 shall be available for
20 all administrative expenses, which shall be on an ac-
21 crual basis, of carrying out the functions of the Admin-
22 istrator under the program of housing loans to educational
23 institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as

1 amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d), but this amount shall
2 be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the
3 Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Fed-
4 eral home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the
5 meaning of the Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance
6 Corporation (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12
7 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary
8 of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the
9 United States.

10 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
11 THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

12 Not to exceed \$477,000 of funds in the revolving
13 fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amend-
14 ments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for admin-
15 istrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of
16 payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve
17 banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan
18 banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act
19 creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of
20 August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has
21 been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a de-
22 pository of public money of the United States.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
2 THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDAT-
3 ING PROGRAMS)

4 During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$139,500
5 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this
6 amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case
7 of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Gov-
8 ernment and legal services on a contract or fee basis and
9 of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve
10 banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the
11 Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-
12 loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of
13 the Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Fed-
14 eral Deposit Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which
15 has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a
16 depository of public money of the United States.

17 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
18 NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

19 Not to exceed \$6,550,000 shall be available for
20 administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual
21 basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses
22 (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed
23 on a contract or fee basis) in connection with the
24 issuance and servicing of securities, depreciation, properly
25 capitalized expenditures, fees for servicing mortgages, ex-

1 penses (including services performed on a force account,
2 contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal serv-
3 ices) in connection with the acquisition, protection, opera-
4 tion, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or
5 personal property belonging to said Association or in which
6 it has an interest, cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other
7 expenses of persons employed outside of the continental
8 United States, expenses of services performed on a contract
9 or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal serv-
10 ices, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other
11 Government agencies, and said Association may utilize and
12 may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal
13 Reserve banks and other agencies of the Government: *Pro-*
14 *vided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to
15 the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance
16 with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

17 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
18 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRA-
19 TION

20 For administrative expenses in carrying out duties im-
21 posed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed \$8,450,000 of
22 the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration
23 shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing
24 Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or
25 allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September

1 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) : *Provided*, That
2 funds shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to
3 exceed \$1,500) : *Provided further*, That nonadministrative
4 expenses of all kinds regardless of source classified by section
5 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, including
6 all appraisal fees regardless of source or method of financing
7 shall not exceed \$50,000,000.

8 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
9 TIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

10 Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such ex-
11 penses by title I of this Act shall be available for the
12 administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administra-
13 tion in carrying out the provisions of the United States
14 Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401-1433) ;
15 purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized
16 by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C.
17 2131) ; and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor
18 vehicle for replacement only: *Provided*, That necessary
19 expenses of providing representatives of the Administra-
20 tion at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with
21 the construction of such non-Federal projects by public
22 housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be
23 compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees
24 which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs
25 of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such serv-

1 ices, and expenditures by the Administration for such
2 purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and
3 funds received from such payments may be used only for
4 the payment of necessary expenses of providing representa-
5 tives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal
6 projects: *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public
7 Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act,
8 in carrying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed
9 \$1,200,000.

10 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

11 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in
12 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
13 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used
14 for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support
15 or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

16 SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in
17 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
18 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to
19 pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel
20 work in excess of the number that would be provided by a
21 ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five,
22 or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent em-
23 ployees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided*,
24 That for purposes of this section employees shall be con-
25 sidered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-

1 time or more in personnel administration consisting of
2 direction and administration of the personnel program;
3 employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and
4 classification; employee relations and services; committees
5 of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners;
6 wage administration; and processing, recording, and
7 reporting.

8 SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this
9 Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-
10 poration or agency included in this Act, shall be used for
11 construction of fallout shelters in Government-owned or
12 leased buildings except where specifically provided.

13 This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices
14 Appropriation Act, 1961".

I N D E X

	Page
Civil Aeronautics Board :	
Salaries and expenses-----	4
Payments to air carriers (liquidation of contract authorization) --	4
Civil and Defense Mobilization, Office of :	
Salaries and expenses-----	2
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies-----	2
Federal contributions-----	3
Emergency supplies and equipment-----	3
Research and development-----	3
Civil Service Commission :	
Salaries and expenses-----	5
Investigation of United States citizens for employment by international organizations-----	6
Annuities under special acts-----	7
Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund-----	7
Payment to Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund-----	8
Employees' Life Insurance Fund, administrative expenses-----	8
Federal Aviation Agency :	
Expenses-----	8
Establishment of air navigation facilities-----	9
Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization) --	10
Research and development-----	10
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport-----	10
Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport-----	11
Construction, Washington National Airport-----	10
General provision-----	11
Federal Communications Commission-----	12
Federal Home Loan Bank Board-----	38
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation-----	40
Federal Power Commission-----	12
Federal Trade Commission-----	12
General Accounting Office-----	13
General Services Administration :	
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service-----	13
Repair and improvement of public buildings-----	14
Construction, public buildings projects-----	14
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects-----	16
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts-----	17
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service-----	17
Expenses, supply distribution-----	18
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service-----	18
Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service--	18
Strategic and critical materials-----	18
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator-----	19
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents-----	20

General Services Administration—Continued	Page
Refunds under Renegotiation Act.....	20
Administrative operations fund	20
General provisions	21
Administrative expenses, Federal Facilities Corporation.....	41
Administrative expenses, RFC Liquidation Fund.....	41
Housing and Home Finance Agency:	
Office of the Administrator:	
Salaries and expenses.....	23
Urban planning grants.....	24
Reserve of planned public works (payment to revolving fund) ..	24
Grants for slum clearance and urban renewal.....	24
Housing for the elderly (payment to revolving fund).....	24
Administrative expenses:	
College housing loans, Office of the Administrator.....	42
Public facility loans, Office of the Administrator.....	43
Revolving fund (liquidating programs), Office of the Adminis- trator.....	44
Federal National Mortgage Association.....	44
Federal Housing Administration.....	45
Public Housing Administration:	
Annual contributions.....	25
Administrative expenses.....	25, 46
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	25
National Aeronautics and Space Administration:	
Salaries and expenses.....	26
Research and development.....	26
Construction and equipment.....	27
General provisions	27
National Capital Housing Authority.....	27
National Science Foundation.....	28
Renegotiation Board.....	29
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	29
Selective Service System.....	29
Veterans Administration:	
General operating expenses.....	30
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	31
Inpatient care.....	31
Outpatient care.....	32
Maintenance and operation of supply depots.....	32
Compensation and pensions.....	33
Readjustment benefits.....	33
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	33
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	34
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.....	34
Administrative provisions.....	35
General provisions.....	36, 47

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11776

[Report No. 1519]

A BILL

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

By Mr. THOMAS

APRIL 14, 1960

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on
the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued April 19, 1960
For actions of April 18, 1960
86th-2d, No. 70

Agricultural attaches.....4		
Appropriations.....2,4,17		
Budget.....10		
Buildings.....1		
CCC.....17		
Civil defense.....2		
Cotton acreage.....17		
Education.....6		
Farm housing.....16		
Farm income.....12		
Farm program.....11,14		
Food distribution.....5	Milk.....1	Soil conservation.....7
Forest fires.....17	Minerals.....15	Special milk.....1
Housing.....16	Monopolies.....13	Sugar.....10
Legislative program.....4	National debt.....10	Surplus food.....5
Library services.....17	Postal rates.....9	Veterans' loans.....3
Loans.....3	Publications.....1	Water resources.....8

HIGHLIGHTS: House received conference report on the special milk bill. Senator Sparkman introduced and discussed housing bill.

HOUSE

1. SPECIAL MILK. Received the conference report on H. R. 9331, the special milk bill (H. Rept. 1520). (pp. 7532-3) The Senate agreed to the conference report on April 14. For a summary of the provisions of the report see Digest 69.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. As reported (see Digest 69), this bill, H. R. 11776, includes items for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, Civil Service Commission, General Accounting Office, General Services Administration, National Science Foundation, Selective Service System, and Veterans' Administration. The bill contains a provision that "Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for reimbursement to the General Services Administration for those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements, performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959."

Following are excerpts from the committee report:

Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.

"The Committee recommends \$6,250,000 for allocation by the OCDM to various Federal agencies to administer delegated responsibilities. The budget estimate proposed increasing the amount by \$3,750,000 but the Committee has approved the same level of funding as in the current year."

Official register. "The Committee has specifically denied \$30,000 included in the estimate for printing the Official Register."

General Services Administration. "The Administration is urged to issue an Executive Order giving the Administrator the authority he needs to tell agencies how much space they can have. Such a request has been pending in the Bureau of the Budget for several months and the Committee is of the opinion it should be issued as it will save the Government millions of dollars annually."

Newspapers and periodicals. "The subject of how much money is being spent by each agency for newspapers and periodicals, including scientific, technical, trade or traffic periodicals is one that deserves careful scrutiny. In former years the bill has contained a \$50 limitation on the amount that could be expended for such purposes unless otherwise specifically provided for, and the language of the provision has excluded scientific, technical, trade and traffic periodicals from its application. A recent decision of the Comptroller General has stated that such publications should be included within the limitation when a specific amount is provided in an appropriation item for newspapers and periodicals, which is different from the interpretation generally made by the agencies. The Committee has removed the limitations on newspapers and periodicals from the bill for this year, but the 1962 justifications for each agency should set forth in full detail all obligations for this type of expense."

Buildings. "Sec. 303. It has come to the Committee's attention that construction costs for public buildings are often unnecessarily increased due to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization by regulation requiring that they include fallout shelters. This may be desirable in some instances, but such a requirement should be specifically justified for each project. The bill accordingly contains a provision that no funds included in this bill shall be used for construction of fallout shelters in Government-owned or leased buildings unless they are specifically provided for."

3. VETERANS' BENEFITS. Received from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, a draft of proposed legislation "To improve the budget and accounting procedures of the loan guaranty program of the Veterans' Administration by establishing a revolving fund"; to Veterans' Affairs Committee. p. 7534

4. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that on Tuesday the House will call the Consent Calendar, consider, under suspension of rules, H. R. 8074, relating to the rotation of agricultural attaches, and also consider the independent office appropriation bill for 1961. p. D313

SENATE

5. SURPLUS FOOD. Both Houses received from this Department a report on the distribution of surplus foods to needy families. pp. 7511, 7534

6. EDUCATION. Both Houses received the semi-annual report of the U. S. Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange. pp. 7512, 7534

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

7. SOIL CONSERVATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Cooley commending the Soil Conservation Service on its 25th anniversary, and inserting his recent address discussing the accomplishments of the Service and the work of former Administrator Hugh H. Bennett. p. A3334

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued April 20, 1960
For actions of April 19, 1960
86th-2d, No. 71

Agricultural attaches.....3	Interest rates.....14	Reclamation.....34
Appropriations.....2	Item veto.....28	Reports.....6
Atomic energy.....10,12	Lands.....8,9	Rural development.....25
Electrification.....10	Milk.....1	Special milk.....1
Farm labor.....19,29	Minerals.....9	Surplus commodities.....26
Farm program.....22,31	Organization.....32	Unemployment.....24
Food additives.....4	Personnel.....3,20,27	Vegetables.....23
Foreign affairs.....18	Postal service.....7	Water pollution.....15
Foreign aid.....21	Property.....5	Watersheds.....17,35
Foreign trade.....16	Public Law 480.....26	Wildlife.....13
Forestry.....8,33		
4-H Clubs.....30		
Grapes and plums.....11		
Information.....32		

HIGHLIGHTS: House agreed to conference report on special milk bill. House debated independent offices appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9331, the special milk bill (p. 7622). This bill will now be sent to the President. See Digest 69 for a summary of the provisions of the bill as agreed to by both Houses.
2. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 11776 (pp. 7626-63). See Digest 70 for items of interest to this Department.
3. PERSONNEL; AGRICULTURAL ATTACHES. Passed over, at the request of Rep. Gross, H. R. 8074, to permit the assignment of agricultural attaches to positions in the U. S. for a maximum of 4 years without reduction in grade. p. 7610
4. FOOD ADDITIVES. Passed as reported H. R. 7847, to make the judicial review provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and the Food Additives Amendment of 1958 subject to the uniform provisions of Public Law 85-791 relating to court review of Government agency orders. p. 7612
Passed over, at the request of Rep. McFall, H. R. 7480, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to provide that the term "chemical

preservatives" shall not apply to a pesticide chemical when used in or on a raw agricultural commodity produced from the soil, and to require that shipping containers for raw agricultural commodities be labeled to indicate by name or function the presence of any pesticide chemical that had been applied after harvest. p. 7615

5. PROPERTY. Passed without amendment H. R. 9983, to extend for two years the period for which payments in lieu of taxes may be made with respect to certain real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries to other Government departments. p. 7612
6. REPORTS. Passed as reported S. 899, to provide for the discontinuance of certain reports now required by law to be submitted to Congress, including several reports of this Department. pp. 7612-5
7. POSTAL SERVICE. Passed without amendment H. R. 10996, to authorize the use of certified mail for the transmission or service of matter required by certain Federal laws to be transmitted or served by registered mail. pp. 7619-20
8. LANDS; FORESTRY. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 981 to provide for the conveyance of a tract of forest land to Florida (H. Rept. 1522). p. 7708
9. MINERALS; LANDS. The Agriculture Committee reported without amendment H. R. 8740, to provide for the leasing of oil and gas interests in certain U. S. lands in Texas (H. Rept. 1523). p. 7708
10. ATOMIC ENERGY; ELECTRIFICATION. The Joint Atomic Energy Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11713, to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission, including reactor development, biology and medicine, co-operative power reactor demonstration program, and design and engineering studies for food irradiation and power reactor of steam-cooler type (H. Rept. 1525). p. 7708

SENATE

11. GRAPES AND PLUMS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendments S. 1857, to establish minimum quality requirements for exported grapes and plums (S. Rept. 1274). p. 7538
12. ATOMIC ENERGY. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy reported an original bill, S. 3387, to authorize appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission (S. Rept. 1277). p. 7538
13. WILDLIFE. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 1781, to provide for cooperative unit programs of research, education, and demonstration of fish and wildlife resources between the Federal Government, colleges and universities, the States and Territories, and private organizations. p. D316
Sen. Bartlett criticized the Secretary of the Interior for issuing regulations relating to fishing in Alaska which he could not have issued "prior to statehood" and which the Senator feels are discriminatory. pp. 7565-71
14. INTEREST RATE. Sen. Symington inserted an article dealing with the political implications in the success of the Treasury to sell a recent bond issue at below the interest-rate ceiling on long-term Government securities. p. 7557

provement of Brays Bayou for flood-control purposes and for which amount such company has not otherwise been reimbursed, and if Houston Belt and Terminal Railway Company had not made such bridge alteration, such alteration would have been made subsequently at the expense of the United States as a part of its flood-control project which included the improvement of Brays Bayou; and such bridge alteration inured to the benefit of the United States in subsequently carrying out such flood-control project which it approved and authorized: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

K. J. McIVER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9752) for the relief of K. J. McIver.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$151.35 to K. J. McIver of Columbia, South Carolina, in full settlement of his claims against the United States for reimbursement for the loss of his personal property when fire destroyed a Government-owned automobile on November 3, 1958, which he had been operating on official business as an employee of the Treasury Department and was struck by a private automobile near Rock Hill, South Carolina: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "Act" strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. HENRY H. COHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11388) for the relief of Dr. Henry H. Cohan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of

any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. Henry H. Cohan of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the sum of \$6,010.59, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained by the said Dr. Cohan as a result of damage to and destruction of his personal property in the warehouse of the Christian J. Ludwig Company, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, by a fire that occurred there on October 4, 1958: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon his conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENTRY OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H.J. Res. 678) relating to the entry of certain aliens.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Hisako Sakai, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sergeant First Class Santiago Magana Juarez, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Chrysavgi Kontopoulos, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. James Kontos, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Janko Tomas Baic, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. George Baic, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Allison Lee Hudson (also known as Kazuka Shima) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

SEC. 5. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Stavros Panagiotis Orfan, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Egnatis Orfan, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria Papaconstantinou, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Eugene A. Megas, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 7. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Carmen Alicia Campos, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Luis Vergara Campos, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 8. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Ivica Basic,

shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Noglich, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 9. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Mariano Vittorio Simeone, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Floyd A. Simeone, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 10. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Jadwiga Franciszka Wybraniec, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. John Wybraniec, citizens of the United States.

SEC. 11. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Aristides Evangelou Katsikes, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Gust Katos.

SEC. 12. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Anna Wala, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. Stanley Wala, a citizen of the United States.

SEC. 13. The natural parents of the beneficiaries of this Act shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 4, after line 3, insert new sections 13 through 35, to read as follows:

"SEC. 13. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Salvatore Savarese, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Michele Savarese, citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 14. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rachele Savarese shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien minor child of Mr. and Mrs. Michele Savarese, citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 15. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Joanna T. Yphantis, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. James Isaac Yphantis, citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 16. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Mleko Nishikawa Yoshida, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Minoru Yoshida, citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 17. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Isabella Valentino, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Berardo Valentino, citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 18. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Eutychia Apostolopoulos, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Constantine Apostolopoulos, citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 19. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Dionisia Loumakis, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Nikolas Loumakis, citizens of the United States.

"SEC. 20. For the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Annunziata Monteroso Cutri, shall be held and considered

to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Cutri, citizens of the United States.

"Sec. 21. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Georgitsa Danelos, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. George S. Danelos, a citizen of the United States.

"Sec. 22. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Branko Namesnik and Katka Namesnik, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Ivan H. Namesnik, citizens of the United States.

"Sec. 23. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Wanda Marianne Maliga, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Maliga, citizens of the United States.

"Sec. 24. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Stanislaw (Gonder) Wojciechowski, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Wojciechowski, citizens of the United States.

"Sec. 25. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Cesarea Longro, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Michele Longro, citizens of the United States.

"Sec. 26. For the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Anna Rosati shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee.

"Sec. 27. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria A. Margaritis, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Athanas Margaritis, citizens of the United States.

"Sec. 28. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Ceferino N. Southerland and Miguel R. Southerland, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Sergeant and Mrs. Andrew Southerland, citizens of the United States.

"Sec. 29. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Mara Zorich, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Luka Zorich, citizens of the United States.

"Sec. 30. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Antonietta Alfonsi, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Enrico Alfonsi, citizens of the United States.

"Sec. 31. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Carmina Paolina Sabatucci, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Nazareno Sabatucci, citizens of the United States.

"Sec. 32. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Maria Jozefa Koziol, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Karol Koziol, citizens of the United States.

"Sec. 33. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Leszek Sharetzsky, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Antonio Sharetzsky, citizens of the United States.

"Sec. 34. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Krystallia Sanderson (also known as Kristallia Mandaka), shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Angelo Sanderson, citizens of the United States.

"Sec. 35. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Joanin P. Demas, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Peter C. Demas, citizens of the United States."

On page 4, line 4, renumber section 13 to read "Sec. 36."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further calling of the Private Calendar, with the exception of Calendar Nos. 456 and 480, be suspended.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, Calendar No. 456, S. 1856, presents a unique situation. It is the case of a father and son who are refugees. The father has a visa and is and has been ready to be moved to live with a relative in the United States, but the son is overseas without a visa. All this bill does is to give the son an opportunity to be moved immediately by using a number at the head of the list instead of waiting for his turn to be reached. I trust the gentleman will permit this bill to go through.

Senator MORSE has talked to me several times about it. It is a very urgent situation.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALTER. I yield.

Mr. HEMPHILL. When I submitted the request I asked that Calendar Nos. 456 and 480 be omitted from the request for the specific purpose of accommodating the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Massachusetts. These two bills would be considered, under my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

FRANK PODANY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1856) for the relief of Frank Podany.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Frank Podany shall be deemed to have been born in Czechoslovakia.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORA V. MARCH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 11190) for the relief of Cora V. March.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cora V. March, Washington, District of Columbia, the sum of \$25,000 in reimbursement for expenditures of the said Cora V. March and her husband, the late General Peyton C. March, incurred by them over a period of many years in the performance of highly important services for the Government of the United States. The expenses reimbursed by this act could not be paid under any other provision of law and were incurred by the late General Peyton C. March and Cora V. March while voluntarily rendering services at the request of the Secretary of War, for which they received no compensation: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, after the words "United States." insert "These services were contributed by General March to the War Department and the Nation following his retirement in 1921 and included personal eyewitness investigations abroad with reports thereon to the Secretary of War for the official use of the U.S. Government with respect to such matters as the military, financial, and economic conditions in Europe, the deployment of U.S. troops, and foreign relations of the United States with our allies and former enemy countries.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. That concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Pending that I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 45]

Adair	Fisher	Moss
Addonizio	Flynn	Moulder
Albert	Fountain	Multer
Alexander	Frazier	Nix
Andersen,	Frelinghuysen	Norblad
Minn.	Gallagher	Osmers
Anderson,	Garmatz	Passman
Mont.	Gary	Perkins
Andrews	Gavin	Philbin
Anfuso	Gilbert	Poage
Ashley	Glenn	Powell
Ashmore	Grant	Prokop
Auchincloss	Gray	Quigley
Bailey	Green, Oreg.	Rabaut
Barden	Green, Pa.	Rains
Barrett	Hagen	Reece, Tenn.
Becker	Halpern	Rees, Kans.
Blitch	Hargis	Riley
Bolton	Harris	Roberts
Bonner	Healey	Robison
Bray	Henderson	Rodino
Breeding	Hess	Rogers, Mass.
Brewster	Hoeven	Rogers, Tex.
Brock	Horan	Rooney
Brooks, La.	Hull	Roosevelt
Buckley	Jackson	Rostenkowski
Burdick	Jennings	St. George
Burleson	Johnson, Md.	Santangelo
Cahill	Jones, Mo.	Scott
Canfield	Keith	Sikes
Carnahan	Keogh	Sisk
Celler	Kilburn	Slack
Chelf	Kling, Calif.	Springer
Chlperfield	King, Utah	Staggers
Collier	Kitchin	Steed
Cook	Kluczynski	Taylor
Cooley	Lafore	Teague, Tex.
Curtis, Mass.	Latta	Teller
Curtis, Mo.	Lesinski	Thompson, La.
Daniels	Libonati	Thompson, N.J.
Davis, Ga.	Lindsay	Tuck
Davis, Tenn.	McGinley	Utt
Devine	McGovern	Wallhauser
Diggs	McSween	Wampler
Dingell	Mack, Ill.	Whitener
Dorn, N.Y.	Magnuson	Whitten
Dorn, S.C.	May	Widnall
Dowdy	Meador	Williams
Downing	Morrow	Willis
Dulski	Metcalfe	Withrow
Durham	Mitchell	Wolf
Edmondson	Moeller	Young
Fallon	Montoya	Younger
Farbstein	Moore	Zelenko
Fenton	Moorhead	
Fino	Morris, N. Mex.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 265 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 503, Rept. No. 1524), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution, the bill H.R. 8601, with the Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same hereby is, taken from the Speaker's table, to the end that the Senate amendments be, and the same are hereby agreed to.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 11776, with Mr. IKARD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the committee brings to you the independent offices appropriation bill for 1961, involving some \$8¼ billion, and I use that as a round figure. There are covered in this bill some 19 agencies. Several of them have three or four or a half dozen parts. The committee, in my humble judgment, has worked out a good comprehensive report. We have reached agreement on practically every item in this bill, and I might say with all accuracy there are no serious disagreements on either side of the aisle, or on either side of the full committee, for that matter, on most of these items. I do not think there is too much in the bill that will give the House too much concern. In a bill of this magnitude, covering as many agencies as it does cover, of course, there is going to be some disagreement; and whether it is serious or not too serious is the question. Practically every agency covered came to the committee wanting an increase in number of personnel. As a matter of fact, I think they wanted an increase in the neighborhood of 7,900. We gave them a little bit more than half of the requests.

Overall, there are cuts throughout the bill amounting to about \$270 million or \$271 million. Of course, there are several agencies covered in this bill which are quite large. The biggest one is the Veterans' Administration, with total appropriations somewhat in excess of \$5 billion, amounting to 60 percent or 65 percent of the total appropriation. The items for the Veterans' Administration are made up largely of compensation and pension items, and, of course, there are the usual items covering hospitalization, research, and so forth.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the membership a little item, but an item that could grow, and an item with which I believe you ought to be conversant. In years gone by we have carried a general limitation in this bill with respect to the allowance for newspapers and periodicals. In the absence of a special or specific limitation in the bill itself for each of the agencies, the limitation for this purpose was \$50. We looked into the situation, and, lo and behold, we found that the item had grown like Topsy. We found that the words "newspapers and periodicals" did not mean exactly that, and it meant something else. Finally, the matter was submitted to the Comptroller General. The Comptroller General said, "The language means just exactly what it says"—and the sequel of it means that you have been spending beyond your limitation.

Mr. Chairman, I have a list here which I will include in my remarks in the RECORD:

Amounts requested in 1961 by agencies in the bill for newspapers and periodicals

Agency	1961 newspaper and periodical limitation requested	1961 total estimated expenditures (including scientific, technical, trade, or traffic periodicals)
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.....	\$8,500	\$17,700
Civil Aeronautics Board.....	1,000	9,000
Civil Service Commission.....	500	3,500
Federal Aviation Agency.....	5,000	21,500
Federal Communications Commission.....	275	6,800
Federal Power Commission.....	500	2,500
Federal Trade Commission.....	1,000	3,500
General Accounting Office.....	500	7,400
General Services Administration:		
Federal Supply Service.....	300	2,100
Expenses, supply distribution.....	250	4,500
Transportation and Public Utilities Service.....	100	4,500
Office of Administrator.....	250	280
Administrative operations fund.....	600	16,000
Housing and Home Finance Agency:		
Office of the Administrator.....	3,000	6,000
Federal Housing Administration.....	1,000	7,700
Public Housing Administration.....		3,900
Federal National Mortgage Association.....		1,000
Interstate Commerce Commission.....	600	10,850
National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Research and development.....	1,000	258,000
National Science Foundation.....	500	4,000
Securities and Exchange Commission.....	1,500	30,500
Selective Service System.....	250	650
Veterans' Administration:		
General operating expenses.....	3,500	18,500
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	2,700	15,000

For example, one agency on this list is the Federal Trade Commission. In this current fiscal year, this agency had a limitation in the bill for newspapers and periodicals of \$700. We found out they spent \$3,200 and they were charging the difference between the \$700 limitation in the bill and the \$3,200 actually spent, to the purchase of technical magazines and trade journals and that such magazines and journals were not counted as newspapers or periodicals. The word "periodicals," as the committee intended it to mean, and the Comptroller General ruled, covers everything. We do not have any bone to pick with the Federal Trade Commission. The limitation for the CAB is \$1,000. In truth they have spent \$9,000. OCDM has a limitation of \$8,500. They were spending \$19,200. The Civil Service Commission has \$250, and they were spending \$3,250, and so on. I will put this in the RECORD. This ought to be corrected.

We took the limitations off and advised them to take the matter up again next year, when we will want full information on this type of expenditure.

There is an item here for the Public Buildings Service in the General Services Administration. That agency supervises many, many different things. It is a difficult job, and I speak the sentiments of the entire committee when I say there is perhaps no finer man or

no more able Administrator in any Government service than Mr. Floete. He has a good staff, and the staff deserves a lot of credit.

The Public Buildings Service deals with public buildings and the operation of them. I want to read some of these figures about what they do. Of course they have no jurisdiction over military buildings or purely postal buildings, but they have enough jurisdiction without that.

Government-owned space this year is 81 million square feet. Leased space is 38,500,000 feet. That is a lot of space that they have to maintain.

But the point I am trying to make, and what I want to show to you, is that we are building some public buildings and we have for the last 2 or 3 years, and in spite of those public buildings, your rent bill inside the District of Columbia itself goes up every year. Yet the Civil Service Commission tells us that after all we have only 2,300,000 people in Government service.

Another group says that perhaps there would be a budget request for 31,000 more employees this year. But they were careful to point out that it was a budget estimate and they had not gotten the money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. This bill is \$1,108 million above the amount spent for the same agencies and departments last year. Will the gentleman tell the House where the bulk of this increase or at least some of the increase comes from?

Mr. THOMAS. Well, the big increase goes to the Veterans' Administration by virtue of a law which Congress passed late last session, increasing pensions and benefits. That is the biggest part of it.

Mr. GROSS. That is \$500 million, as I understand it.

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. GROSS. There is still \$600 million more.

Mr. THOMAS. The next increase is for the space agency. They have budget estimates for \$915 million. This is an increase of 375 or 400 million dollars over last year.

There was another substantial increase in the Federal Aviation Agency.

That is the lion's share; it is 98 percent of the increase.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMAS. I shall be delighted to.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any supergrades in this bill?

Mr. THOMAS. There is money in here for them, not any new authorization.

Mr. GROSS. That is what I mean, authorization.

Mr. THOMAS. The answer to that is No.

Mr. GROSS. Then you did not give the Federal Power Commission the supergrades they asked for?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. On page 9 of the bill I notice \$5,000 for entertainment to the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think this business of the agencies coming in and getting money for entertainment funds has been overdone to some extent?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, I do, and I am glad the gentleman asked that question. We had submitted to us requests by several agencies for an allowance for this type of expenditure. Some we questioned, some we did not; some we cut, some we allowed. But here is the way these agencies put it up to us: Some of them are doing business with folks abroad or folks from abroad coming here, and there naturally has to be some entertainment. We gave it consideration.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Let me point out to the gentleman that it does not say anything about overseas operations and this \$5,000 for entertainment could be spent in the United States of America if they wanted to.

Mr. THOMAS. I direct the gentleman's attention to the original authorization.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: This \$10,000 on page 27 of the bill in connection with the Space Agency; is that for entertainment too?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes; that is for entertainment. They wanted \$20,000 but we cut it half in two.

Mr. GROSS. That is by reason of the fact that it has been fashionable to entertain overseas; is that right?

Mr. THOMAS. That was my impression but I will say to my colleague, they have 25 or 30 tracking stations in many countries. I expect they are in 40 or 50 overseas countries doing business. We decided we had better let them have a little expense money.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, as our distinguished chairman of the subcommittee has pointed out, the Subcommittee on Independent Offices Appropriations has had an arduous task in dealing with some \$8,413,000,000 requested by some 18 agencies of our Federal Government.

I should like to take this opportunity, first of all, to pay tribute to our distinguished chairman who has done such an outstanding job in guiding the work of this committee and his great fund of knowledge with regard to the operations and functions of all of these independent agencies of our national government.

It has been a pleasure to work alongside of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

And then on our minority side, we have had the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS]. It has been rather harmonious, and while the chairman has pointed out that there is no real serious

disagreement among the members of the committee as to dollars and programs, there are some differences, of course, in a program so expansive and covering such a wide area of operation.

As our chairman has pointed out, these 18 independent agencies have requested an appropriation of \$8,413,000,000 for the fiscal year 1961.

This bill in and of itself provides for \$8.145 billion, or a reduction made by the committee of approximately \$270 million.

It might interest you to know that of the 18 agencies and of the \$8¼ billion, there are four agencies within this appropriation bill that absorb seven-eighths of the total appropriation. They are the Veterans' Administration, the Federal Aviation Agency, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, and the General Services Administration.

I might point out in connection with the Veterans Administration and our veterans program that this area constitutes five-eighths of this total appropriation bill.

With regard to the Veterans' Administration, I want to point with pride and pay tribute to the outstanding job that the Veterans' Administration is doing in the interest of our veterans and good government. The VA has operated efficiently and it has operated well. The point remains, however, that we must provide the compensation and pensions necessary for the veterans of America. You might be interested to know there are now 3,235,000 veterans receiving compensation and pensions. The bill under the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration calls for a total sum of \$5.397 billion, but the amount recommended by the committee is a reduction of \$74 million. This was not in the area of veterans' benefits or veterans' services, but primarily in relation to building construction. The area of compensation and pensions for our veterans calls for a sum of \$3.8 billion for next year. Readjustment benefits amount to \$344 million. I might call your attention to the fact that in connection with the veterans' program the committee increased the amount over the budget request by \$1.6 million, which was applied to the medical research program, granting a total appropriation of \$17 million for that purpose.

I shall not go into any further detail as to the veterans' program or of any of the other agencies, for that matter, because time will not permit. Suffice it to say that the big areas of appropriations and the big areas requiring the most serious consideration apply to the four agencies I have previously mentioned.

The Federal Aviation Agency has come in for considerable attention and concern. I am confident everyone is aware of the fact that the Federal Aviation Agency is in some respects a new agency of government and doing a tremendous job. I might point out to you that the Federal Aviation Agency and the space agency are comparatively new agencies as far as this committee is concerned. They account for a large part of the increases over previous ap-

propriation bills for the independent agencies.

The budget estimate for the Federal Aviation Agency was \$713 million. The committee has approved \$671 million or a reduction of \$41 million. When we pause to take into account the terrific expansion of this Agency and the responsibility for the traffic controls, for that regulation, and for the use and control of our airways throughout this country, you can well imagine the terrific expansion and the added responsibility that is going to be ours through the means of this Agency.

I might point out, too, that within the Federal Aviation Agency appropriation \$80 million is included for grants to localities for airports. This is in line with the budget request.

Then, in connection with the space agency, the budget request totaled \$915 million. The committee approved the total sum of \$876 million, which amounts to a reduction of approximately \$39 million. The space agency, as you well know, is comparatively new, and while this is a substantial increase over the budget request and the appropriation of last year, I am sure that we are all agreed that the space agency has made terrific strides in this past year. Most of these funds are for important projects involving research, the Mercury project, the Delta vehicle, the Saturn program, all of them having to do with the exploration of outer space. The Mercury program begins man's travel in space, and the committee has approved the sum of \$105 million for this purpose. It might be well to take into consideration in our thinking about the space agency in that we have recently transferred, by authority of the Congress, the Saturn project from the jurisdiction of the Army ballistic missile center to the new space agency. The recent successes that have been realized by virtue of the space program, the Tiros, Pioneer V, and Explorer VII, are good examples. And, I might say, that in the testimony before our committee Dr. Glennan and others of authority assure us that there is no country in the world, including Russia, that has realized the same progress and our success in the exploration of outer space. We are definitely out in front and I feel that we can be well satisfied with our record to date.

Now, there are probably a number of items that will come before the committee for consideration during the debate and the discussion of this bill relating to the General Services Administration and Public Buildings. The Federal supply service is an important part of the GSA. Utilization transfers to civilian agencies was \$141 million last year and expected to reach \$215 million this year. I assume that further discussion will take place in connection with the cut that was made by the committee dealing with two specific hospitals in the veterans' program. However, the point remains that these items can and will be discussed on their own merits, and I shall not take the time of the committee to discuss these items at this time. Practically all of the agencies have received their normal amount of funds.

All of these agencies have not been adjusted upward or downward to any measurable degree, and while the committee has done a job in trying to retrench and reduce Government spending, I am sure that we do not look on \$270 million, which the committee took out of this appropriation bill, as being a small amount. I think when we reduce this bill by some \$270 million and make it stick, that that is a substantial amount in retrenchment, and I hope, generally speaking, that the main provisions of this bill and the items in it will prevail.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Chairman, I notice in the report and in the bill that consideration has been given by the committee to the request of the General Services Administration in regard to customhouses along the Maine border. This is a program that we have been interested in over a number of years. One new customhouse is under construction and is to be completed at Madawaska, and the bill carries a provision for a customhouse at Jackman, Maine, in the Second Congressional District, and in Vanceboro and Van Buren, in the Third Congressional District. I certainly wish to express to the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking minority member and other members of the committee our appreciation for their consideration of these items in this bill.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. OSTERTAG asked and was given unanimous permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, 2½ years ago Congress enacted Public Law 85-606 which represented an increased Federal commitment to the support of civil defense in this country. That law described civil defense as the joint responsibility of the Federal, State, and local governments and authorized the expenditure of \$25 million of Federal funds annually for matching, on a 50-50 basis, State and local civil defense personnel and administrative costs.

Prior to the enactment of Public Law 85-606, Federal contributions in support of State and local personnel and administrative costs were specifically prohibited by the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950. The removal of that prohibition and the authorization of \$25 million annually for this purpose has been hailed in some quarters as the only positive civil defense step taken by the Federal Government in the past 10 years. To date, however, even that step has turned out to be an empty gesture.

On three separate occasions the House has refused to appropriate funds in support of personnel and administrative costs. In each instance that provision of the appropriation bill has been eliminated by the Independent Offices Sub-

committee of the Appropriations Committee. It is my understanding that this year the subcommittee included funds for this purpose, only to have the provision eliminated by the full Committee on Appropriations before the bill was reported to the House. The funds in question amount to \$12 million.

I am generally familiar with the arguments usually advanced by opponents of this type of assistance to the States. In the past, it has been said that this money would be used to hire political workers at various city halls throughout the country, and that the Federal Government would have no way of monitoring the use of these funds to see that qualified workers are appointed to carry out essential civil defense functions. Such charges are unfounded. Public Law 85-606 specifically requires a merit system for all civil defense employees at the State and local levels in order to establish eligibility for these funds. The act requires the States to submit detailed administrative plans for approval by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, and it is my understanding that all 50 States have submitted such plans and that such plans have been approved.

On numerous occasions in the past I have expressed to the House my personal belief that the civil defense tasks in this country can be carried out only through vastly increased Federal programs. My belief has not changed in this respect, but in the absence of such Federal action, financial assistance in support of State and local programs represents a step in the right direction.

During the past year it has been my privilege to work with the Governors' Conference Special Committee on Civil Defense, chaired by Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York. Gov. Pat Brown, of California, also serves on this committee, as do Governor William, of Michigan, Governor Clyde, of Utah, and Governor Hollings, of South Carolina. At the request of Governor Brown, I met with the committee to help plan the agenda for the White House Conference on Fallout Protection which took place last January.

At the conclusion of that conference, the committee issued a unanimous statement calling for increased Federal assistance for civil defense in this country.

I may note also that a year ago, in the absence of Federal action, Governor Rockefeller made a bold attempt to cope with some of the pressing civil defense problems at the State level through enactment of far-reaching State legislation. The New York State legislature, however, refused to accept the full responsibility and the Governor was forced to withdraw his proposed legislation and turn to the Federal Government with a renewed plea for increased financial assistance.

I am not submitting an amendment at this time to restore the \$12 million item to the Appropriation bill, but I hope the Senate will see the folly of this type of penny-pinching and make full restoration before the bill reaches the conference stage. If the Members will take the necessary time to examine the fundamental issues involved, I believe the

House will be willing to accept a conference report providing for such a restoration.

During the past 5 years the House Military Operations Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, has conducted numerous studies and investigations of civil defense requirements in this country. In our reports we have endeavored to point up the need for civil defense activity at every level of Government, with special emphasis on the urgency of immediate Federal action.

In the beginning our subcommittee was almost alone in recognizing the growing importance of civil defense, but in recent years there has been a noticeable increase in public awareness of our civil defense needs. I hope the Congress will take this opportunity to stimulate and help this effort to achieve the proper recognition instead of rebuffing the State and localities at this critical moment in our history.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

(Mr. RHODES of Arizona asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, this is a bill of rather considerable magnitude which has been reported by a subcommittee which has worked long and hard under the very able chairmanship of the always genial gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

This subcommittee has a jurisdiction which is certainly broad to say the least. It is a jurisdiction which, as a relatively new member of the committee, I have found very difficult to master. However, I feel that the fact that this subcommittee has worked in this area has caused the agencies which are embraced within that jurisdiction to do a better job than otherwise they might have done. I think we have been fair in almost all instances with these agencies and where we have cut too deeply one year we have done our best to rectify such action in future years. I do not intend to claim for this subcommittee any degree of omnipotence or omniscience or any other virtues which do not apply to the average, ordinary individual. We are doing our work as best we can and trying as best we can to do right by the agencies which we have the honor to represent in the appropriations field, and also, to be fair to, and mindful of the burdens borne by that modern day Atlas, the American taxpayer.

I may say, Mr. Chairman, that one of the glamour boys of the area which we represent is the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I say that in no derogatory sense because certainly it is not only a glamorous agency but one that is entrusted with a mission which in my opinion is as important as any mission any department in the Government now possesses.

I feel a sense of urgency as far as outer space is concerned. I know there are those who feel it might be a nice luxury to be able to master the use of space travel, to go to the near planets, and some time, perhaps, in the distant future another generation of Americans

may go to the far planets or far beyond. But to me there is an ordinary, every day, 1960 type emergency too. Up there in space we have an unoccupied area which might be put to military use if an enemy were able to use it. If an enemy of this country desired to occupy that space and we were unable to do so, then possibly some use might be made arising from that very fact of occupancy which would be inimical to the best interests of the United States of America. In other words, if I had to tell the House right now what use could be made of outer space militarily, I would probably have to pass, because I could not possibly predict this. However, you do not have to be much of a military genius to know that the mere nonexistence of a certain art in the state of war at this time does not preclude the existence of that art some time in the future. You do not have to be very smart to know that if there is an area which an enemy can occupy and you cannot occupy, that enemy will be bending every effort to make use of the area and to do so at your expense. So to me this is a very important agency and one which I feel we have provided well for and should continue to provide well for as time goes on.

Another agency toward which I have a great feeling of urgency is the Federal Aviation Agency. I do not think it is necessary to go into this too deeply because everybody knows that this is the agency which promulgates the rules and regulations for the operation of aircraft, for the certification of aircraft and personnel, for standards of maintenance, and for almost everything which goes into the safety of citizens who travel by air, whether those citizens travel by commercial carrier or by private aircraft.

I feel also that we did a good job of providing for the needs of this agency. However, as airplanes come into being and into operation which are faster and faster, there will be increasing need for research, development, and new equipment to provide the necessities of air safety for the people of this country.

In the Federal Trade Commission section of this bill the committee has provided some 75 new positions. In the report we state that we feel a great sense of urgency toward the antimonopoly and antimerger work of the Federal Trade Commission. We state that 73 new positions were created for this particular facility, and 2 additional hearing examiners. The fact that the increases for the Federal Trade Commission appear to be fairly well earmarked for the items which I have mentioned, does not, I am sure, constitute a directive to the Federal Trade Commission not to operate in other areas such as that encompassed by the Textile Labeling Act, for example. In other words, the money is there, and full authority exists to operate in this area, and the mere failure to mention certain activities in the report is not in any sense to be interpreted as a directive not to operate such activities.

Mr. THOMAS. I think the gentleman speaks the sentiments of the committee 100 percent.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, I have not had any individual or group of individuals indicate any amount of dissatisfaction with this bill except for the appropriation for the Veterans' Administration, insofar as hospitals are concerned. If I disagree with the subcommittee or the majority of the subcommittee on any one item, it will be in this particular area. But, I want to say again, Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any group of Members of Congress who have worked harder or longer and gotten along better, and who have at times disagreed, but never in a disagreeable manner, as have the members of the subcommittee on independent offices, on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. MATTHEWS. If I may, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] to answer one brief question. I notice there is an item of \$25 million that has been made available for the acquisition of sites and for the planning of new Federal buildings. Could the gentleman tell me if included in that amount there is an item of \$350,000 for a Federal building at Gainesville, Fla.?

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman from Florida is 100 percent correct.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague very much, and I also want to thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding at this time.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I congratulate the gentleman from Florida for clearing up this matter. The gentleman has served his people well today, as he does every day.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I thank my colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], a member of the committee, 10 minutes.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. This bill bears the stamp of our very dynamic and able chairman, Mr. THOMAS, the gentleman from Texas, with whom I have served for 12 years as a member of this subcommittee. Each year my respect and admiration for the gentleman's abilities continue to grow. Service on his subcommittee each year has been a distinct pleasure and privilege to learn with him more of the operations of my Government agencies. He is without a peer as a chairman and as a Member of the House.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, brings to the House recommendations for appropriations of \$3,146 million plus. It covers appropriations for 19 different agencies of government, including the regulatory agencies, and it is about one of these that I want to address myself now. Having worked as a member of the staff of a regulatory agency myself, I appreciate the very detailed and complicated nature of the functions they perform. The work seems endless, particularly

when facts and estimates are under contest and subjected to close scrutiny by contesting parties. Even if the Commissioners and their staff are imbued with an overwhelming desire to perform their duties conscientiously and expeditiously, they encounter great difficulties in carrying out its purposes, but in spite of these they can perform their tasks. If, however, there is little intent or zeal on the part of the Commissioners to promote the public good and to exercise their legislative responsibilities, the agency is doomed. It must inevitably deteriorate and fail. The damage done to the public, which expects the protection intended by the legislation creating the agency, is irreparable.

The Federal Power Commission is one of the most important agencies of our Government. It was established originally to protect the public in a number of fields. The wholesale sale of electric power is one of its functions. Another responsibility given to it in 1938 was to protect the public from gouging by excessive rates filed by gas companies engaged in selling gas in interstate commerce.

Commission members during the 1930's and 1940's did a fine job in the public interest. But with the 1950's began a disintegration of its operations, until today it is not carrying on the purposes given to it by the Congress. Its morale has been shattered. Since 1953 particularly its able and conscientious staff members have either been replaced or departed voluntarily. The Commission, which was directed by the Congress to protect the public from unfair and exorbitant rates, is not interested in protecting the public as it should be. Actually the Commission is on a sitdown strike against the congressional mandate to regulate the natural gas industry.

Up to the late 1940's when the question was raised as to whether natural gas producers should be subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission, there was some conflict of opinion. It was to settle any doubts that the bill to exempt the producers of natural gas from regulation was filed in the Congress in 1949, but it was never enacted into law. Then, in 1954, in the famous Phillips case, the Supreme Court ruled that producers of natural gas were subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission. In an effort to overrule that decision, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], filed a bill in 1955 the effect of which was to exempt producers from effective regulation, but again that bill did not become law. Since that time the bill has not again been filed, and for a very good reason—there has been no need for the bill. Natural gas producers are not being regulated effectively now. There is no effective rate regulation. The Federal Power Commission has refused to take the steps necessary to bring natural gas producers within the regulatory processes. Having testified on several occasions in favor of the legislation exempting producers of natural gas, the Commissioners apparently take the position that this relieves them of the responsibility of enforcing the law.

Thus, in the 6 years since 1954 when the Phillips decision was rendered by the

Supreme Court—6 years mind you—the reluctant Federal Power Commission has not moved to carry out the law.

Last year in an extension of the Phillips case, one of the Federal Power Commission's most able and experienced examiners completed months of testimony by writing a decision which promulgated a set of rules for the regulation of rates for the natural gas industry. It could have been done years ago had the Federal Power Commission wanted to do so. It should have been done years ago, but regardless of this point, the fact remains that it was done last year. For one whole year the Commission has been deliberating over that decision and has not yet acted. Recently it has been disclosed that the Phillips Co. has made an offer of settlement under which it would not appeal the examiner's decision if certain findings were made. It was an offer which in effect would negate the entire purpose of the proceedings and the examiner's decision. If accepted, its effect will be to set back the cause of good regulation for years. The rate of increase of gas rates over the years has been shocking. The prices of gas produced by independent producers at the wellhead have doubled or trebled within the last decade because of lack of thorough consideration by the Power Commission. Even increases in rates of pipeline companies, which admittedly are subject to regulation by the Commission, have not received the complete and painstaking examination necessary in the public interest.

Mr. Chairman, I read from GD Information Service of April 15, 1950, page 5:

This report indicates a steady and rapid increase in price at each of the three levels in the gas industry. This is not to say, of course, that all of the increase in pipeline rates is attributable solely to increases in purchased gas costs; claimed increases in

rate of return and increases due to expensive expansion have also has their impact. Yet, an analysis of pipeline rate filings does support the claim that most of such filings were precipitated by an increased cost in purchased gas, and that of all pipeline rate increases made in the past 5 years, at least 50 percent of the total dollars is attributable to the increased wellhead price (even after eliminating the effect of duplicative filings).

The Commission attempts to show its activities on behalf of the public in rate matters in its discussion on page 206 and the following pages of the hearings, but the information is obviously incomplete. The information furnished is only a small fraction of the total rate picture.

Mr. Chairman, I quote again from GD Information Service as follows:

THE INCREASE IN PIPELINE RATES

Although pipeline rates have increased steadily during almost all of the 1950's, the increases have been particularly sharp since mid-1957. It is difficult, of course, to make a wholly accurate estimate of the magnitude of this rise, yet it seems clear that it would be on the order of 30-35 percent. Since mid-1957, each of the three largest pipelines—United Gas Pipe Line, El Paso Natural Gas, and Tennessee Gas Transmission—have made effective, or have proposed to make effective, rate increases ranging from 34-40 percent. Again, it should be noted that although there has been a steady pattern of filings during the past 3 years, the situation seems, if anything, to be getting worse. Within the past 6 months all but two of the major pipelines have either made rate increases effective or have filed for increases.

A comparison of the change in rates during the past 3 years for several major pipelines is shown below. In each case the rate shown is the rate at 100 percent load factor; this was done to facilitate comparison between rates. The inclusion of Tennessee, El Paso, and United seems obvious; these are the three largest companies, and serve the Northeast, the South, and the west coast, respectively. Panhandle and Northern were included as relatively old-line companies serving different areas of the Midwest.

Table IV

Pipeline	Area	Rate at 100 percent L.F.		Increase	
		Mid-1957	Mid-1960	Cents per M cubic feet	Percent
		Cents	Cents		
United Gas Pipe Line.....	Mississippi.....	18.8	27.2	8.4	51.1
El Paso Natural Gas.....	California.....	23.8	33.4	9.6	40.3
Panhandle Eastern.....	Michigan.....	26.3	33.9	7.6	28.9
Northern Natural.....	Minnesota.....	30.7	36.6	5.9	9.2
Tennessee Gas.....	New York.....	38.0	49.7	11.7	30.8

Depiction of the increase in rates of existing pipelines does not fully portray the rise in the cost of purchased gas to distributors and consumers. In recent years, a number of new, high-priced pipelines, or high-priced projects, have been certificated. Thus, for example, authorization of the Transwestern line, which would bring 45-cent gas into California, does not show up as an increase in pipeline rates, but the impact on the distributing companies is similar. So, too, with the Trunkline project to serve Consumers Power. Changes in the source of gas supply can have a like effect—Panhandle's abandonment of its sale to Michigan Consolidated was estimated to increase that company's gas costs by \$5 million annually.

THE PRICE OF GAS AT THE RETAIL LEVEL

When it filed its amicus brief in the CATCO case a year ago, the FPC sought to

argue that, whatever its past dereliction in the area of producer regulation, there had been no adverse effect on the consumer. To demonstrate this, the FPC brief cited various figures published by the Bureau of Mines and Bureau of Labor Statistics. Subsequently, by letter to the court, the FPC conceded that it had used some of these figures erroneously.

The question of impact on the consumer is an important one, and bears careful study. Utilizing the figures compiled monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, it becomes apparent that there has been a marked change in the retail price of natural gas in the past few years; again the key date appears to be mid-1957.

Table V shows the changes in the retail price index for natural gas; for purposes of comparison the overall Consumer Price In-

dex (CPI) is also shown. This chart indicates that following the Korean war the Consumer Price Index went up drastically, reaching 113.5 in 1952. It then tended to level off during the next 3 years before beginning a second but more gradual rise, which is apparently still continuing. The index for natural gas, on the other hand, did not jump with the Korean war, but, in 1951, after 3 years of relative stability, began a steady 6-year upward ascent of approximately three points per year. As a result, the natural gas index caught up with the CPI in 1955 and continued roughly level with it until 1957. Since 1957, however, the natural gas index climbed at a much sharper rate than the Consumer Price Index: In 1957 both indexes were 120.2—in other words, they had climbed to precisely the same degree since the 1947–49 base period; the latest figures (February 1960) indicate that although the CPI is 125.6 (an increase of only

5.4 points since 1957) the natural gas index is 140.3 (an increase of 20.1 points).

TABLE V.—Bureau of Labor Statistics indexes for natural gas and Consumer Price Index, 1950–59

[1947–49=100]						
	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
Gas.....	100.8	100.5	103.7	108.2	110.6	115.7
CPI.....	102.8	111.0	113.5	114.4	114.8	114.5
	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960 ¹	
Gas.....	117.8	120.2	127.9	132.6	140.3	
CPI.....	116.2	120.2	123.5	124.6	125.6	

¹ February 1960.

A comparison by months (table VI) shows an even darker picture, and pegs the date of the present rise at July 1957.

TABLE VI.—BLS indexes for natural gas and Consumer Price Index, 1957–60 (by months)

	1957		1958		1959		1960	
	Gas	Consumer Price Index	Gas	Consumer Price Index	Gas	Consumer Price Index	Gas	Consumer Price Index
January.....	119.0	118.2	125.6	122.3	130.1	123.8	138.7	125.4
February.....	118.9	118.7	126.2	122.5	130.7	123.7	140.3	125.6
March.....	118.9	118.9	126.3	123.3	130.6	123.7	-----	-----
April.....	118.8	119.3	126.3	123.5	130.0	123.9	-----	-----
May.....	118.8	119.6	126.9	123.6	130.3	124.0	-----	-----
June.....	118.6	120.2	127.7	123.7	130.9	124.5	-----	-----
July.....	118.7	120.8	127.9	123.9	131.4	124.9	-----	-----
August.....	120.9	121.0	128.5	123.7	132.4	124.8	-----	-----
September.....	121.8	121.1	129.5	123.7	135.5	125.2	-----	-----
October.....	122.0	121.1	129.8	123.7	135.6	125.5	-----	-----
November.....	122.8	121.6	129.8	123.9	135.8	125.6	-----	-----
December.....	122.8	121.6	130.1	123.7	137.5	125.5	-----	-----
Annual average.....	120.2	120.2	127.9	123.5	132.6	124.6	-----	-----

SOME TENTATIVE CONCLUSIONS

Most of the figures used in this report are averages, and, by definition, averages may and usually do include a wide range of individual prices. Unquestionably there are some areas of the country in which the retail price of gas has remained stable or has declined since mid-1957; by the same token, there will be areas in which the increase in price is much sharper than the average. The same, of course, holds true with respect to the wellhead prices shown in tables I and II, and with respect to the pipeline prices shown in table IV. Yet, the use of average prices does have validity, for it shows, as individual prices do not, the overall impact on the Nation.

So far as the increase in producer prices is concerned, most of the increase is directly attributable to higher prices in new contracts (i.e. attributable to the FPC's initial price policy) rather than to producer rate increase filings under section 4. The most remarkable aspect about the rapid rise in producer prices during the 1950's, and particularly since 1954, is that it has been accomplished in the absence of any real showing that a higher price was needed either to keep the gas producers financially healthy or to encourage exploration. Instead the rise has resulted from the producers' ability to demand, almost entirely on the basis of what the market would bear, an ever higher price for gas reserves.

Nor is it a question of inadequate appropriations, Mr. Chairman. If the Commission had given any indication—I repeat, any indication—of a dedication to public interest, there would have been a determined fight by those of us who favor the purposes of the Federal Power

Commission Act to provide its total appropriation. But certainly, insofar as the Natural Gas Act is concerned, the Commission is not a regulatory agency. It is essentially a repository for the papers filed by those subject to its regulation.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. VANIK. I want to concur in the remarks of the gentleman. I agree with him thoroughly. I think the Federal Commission has permitted the gas rate increase that has been applied for.

Mr. YATES. In effect, there is no need any longer for the Harris bill or the Kerr bill, because of the administrative inactivity; yes the calculated overlooking of the requirements of the law by the present Federal Power Commission. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to leave the regulatory agencies now and note several good things that are contained in the bill which have not yet been mentioned. One is the provision of \$5 million to initiate a pilot program in an area of critical need, housing for the elderly in this country. The Housing Act of 1959 contained an authorization of \$50 million for the construction by nonprofit organizations of housing for our aged citizens. Yet, the Bureau of the Budget refused to approve an appropriation for this item. Not one penny. The committee overruled the administration. Recognizing the desperate plight of so many of our senior citizens, the committee began a

program which it hopes will take hold and grow. There are 14 or 15 million Americans over 65 years of age. Their needs require the attention of Congress not only in the field of housing but also in the field of medical care, employment, recreation and others. In the field of employment they are being discriminated against terribly and we must take steps to break down this discrimination. An authoritative study was made by the 20th Century Fund a few years ago. It estimated that 60 percent of the people in the country aged 65 and over had incomes of less than \$1,000 a year; only 20 percent had incomes of over \$2,000 a year. Obviously, they need help, and I am proud and delighted with our committee for establishing this pilot program for housing for the elderly. We hope it will serve as the basis, as the framework for an expanded program in the future.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. FASCELL. I want to compliment the gentleman for his interest over a long period of time in this particular field. It is one of the major social problems confronting the people of this country. I would like to concur in his remarks on the need for this program of housing for the elderly and also to compliment the committee for putting this pilot program in the bill.

I rise in strong support of the committee's recommendation that the House appropriate \$5 million to initiate a pilot program for the construction of housing for the elderly.

After considerable study, discussion, and deliberation last year, Congress enacted into law a program calling for establishment of a revolving fund of \$50 million by which long-term, favorable interest loans could be made to private nonprofit corporations interested in developing housing specifically designed to accommodate our elderly population. I was an enthusiastic cosponsor of this legislation which I felt provided a practical and sound answer to one of the most pressing needs of the elderly—housing specially designed to suit their physical needs and tailored to their financial limitations.

The administration declined to exercise the authority granted in the Housing Act of last year, and submitted no budget request for the program for the coming fiscal year. I heartily commend Chairman THOMAS and his committee members for the decisive, affirmative action they took in recommending an appropriation to get this program underway, with instructions that the administration report back next year on the results of the test program which the committee directed be initiated in widely separated parts of the United States.

As the Representative of the Fourth District of Florida which includes Miami, Miami Beach, and Key West—an area blessed with a mild, temperate climate so attractive to those of advanced years—I have had a continuing interest in the affairs and the problems and the needs of the large number of elderly we are fortunate in counting among our population in south Florida.

This interest and concern is shared by an alert and enlightened citizenry in the Greater Miami area. This community has undertaken a tremendous program of practical, responsive assistance to its elderly residents.

We have, as a community, long understood that piecemeal efforts are inadequate. The concept of a total approach through basic research and welfare services, and a coordination of the two, has been in all of our minds for many years.

One basis for that opinion is the fact that University of Miami faculty members, with administration encouragement, have consistently been officers and committee members of the welfare planning council. Three university members are on its current executive board. Two of the three chairmen of the senior citizens division have been university people. Further, in the field of the aging, the university and the council are linked in a joint committee. In the 2 years of this joint association the difficulties of combining research and services have been aired in extensive and often heated debate. Friendships between town and gown have emerged unblemished; much knowledge of the extent and difficulty of the joint association has been had, and the groundwork for mutual efforts have been laid.

Perhaps a chronological listing of events may best present the facts:

In 1954 the senior citizens division was established as a coordinating planning division with the welfare planning council. The three other divisions—family and child service, health and recreation—at first overshadowed the senior citizens division. This has been overcome. There is present acceptance of a concern for the aged in the other divisions.

In 1955 establishment with the university school of medicine of a geriatrics clinic. The leadership of Dr. Samuel Gertman, and the useful progress of the clinic, are known to you and need not be elaborated here. Dr. Gertman's dedication and energy have stimulated many projects in the field and his influence is certain of continuing value to the community.

In 1957 establishment of a council on gerontology at the University of Miami. The members of this body, appointed by the president of the university, were drawn from the fields of medicine, education, sociology, psychology, human relations, government, law and economics. The council was set up to act as a clearinghouse for university research in gerontology and to maintain active liaison with community organizations conducting programs on behalf of the aged.

In 1957 formation of the joint committee on gerontological projects. In the community were agencies eager to expand services and attempt new methods. There seemed potential value in a joining of forces for cooperative and multidisciplinary work among agencies and the university. The welfare planning council and the university council on gerontology each appointed its members to the joint committee. Several surveys and demonstration projects were pre-

pared and submitted by members of the committee. Since programs must be based on adequate financing, a structure was created whereby the university might receive funds and administer them on behalf of approved projects.

The joint committee—and its principals—may be compared to an existing machine ready for service but lacking fuel. The university is a young one, not yet having sufficient endowment to release faculty for research projects contemplated by the joint committee. The welfare planning council is dependent upon united fund money. Its professional staff likewise has a work load which permits no further burdens. Meanwhile the professional and lay workers involved are going about their tasks in specific areas, many of these related to what the joint committee might undertake if activated. If I may use myself as an example: I am chairman of the senior citizens division, member of the welfare planning council executive board, chairman of the public relations subcommittee of the implementation committee—serving to implement a self-survey recently completed—member of an organizing committee for a 3-year study of chronic illness in Dade County; board member of the James E. Scott Community Center. The university releases time from its own affairs for the performance of these committee duties. Comparable time-consuming assignments are met by many university faculty members. All of these services intermesh with lay workers and professionals in welfare agencies to constitute an in-being joint effort.

In the field of geriatrics—as will appear in an attached report of the research projects in our school of medicine—there are ample outside funds for research in the medical problems of the aging. In the allied disciplines necessary to the conduct of gerontological projects—sociology, psychology, economics, and so forth—we must abide in hope that outside funds will make possible the underwriting of the administrative direction necessary to get the show on the road.

For your understanding of the situation in Dade County, the above brief historical summary needs to be supplemented by what promising projects are currently underway in the county. Without burdening you with too much detail, let me touch on some of the present prospects, all of them having some university and community liaison through "interlocking directorates."

SENIOR CITIZENS DIVISION

Friendly visiting project: The Junior League of Miami pays for a half-time trained social worker to guide the program. A pilot project to determine the need and to indoctrinate volunteers, accomplished 2 years ago, preceded the present going program.

Housing for the elderly: The senior citizens division provided the stimulus for the first public housing for the aged in this area. Martin Fine, member of the Miami Housing Authority, is chairman of the senior citizens division housing committee. The site for a 60-unit low-cost housing project for the

aged has been selected, the architect chosen, and construction scheduled to begin this summer.

Day center: The above housing project also includes a building for a day center to be maintained by the housing authority. The division is presently engaged in organizing a countywide day center board of governors with a view to underwriting the staffing of the day center. A budget of \$35,000 a year is contemplated, with expectation that the day center will eventually receive united fund support. This will be a pilot plant which many present senior citizens may emulate. Civic response is high.

A second day center is projected for Miami Beach. Details cannot be as yet disclosed. We feel that day centers are of prime importance for both service and research. The local newspapers are lined up to give support. We feel that successful day centers will provide a platform for public education in the whole spectrum of problems of the aged. We are involving substantial citizen support. While it will be a year before the centers can be organized and opened, they will surely be so and on a sound staffing basis.

Nursing homes: Three years ago the division began joint meetings with the operators of nursing homes, overcoming an initial suspicion on their part. Two nursing homes institutes have been held with excellent results. The very real problems of nursing home operators have been made known to county authorities concerned.

The late Dr. Michael Takos, of the county health department and also a member of the division, initiated an epidemiological survey of indigent patients in local nursing homes. This is being continued with Dr. A. W. Menzin, Dr. Takos' successor, in cooperation with Dr. Eugene Flipse of the university school of medicine. The report is nearing completion. The university, through its IBM services and through its sociology, anthropology and psychological departments, aids in the planning and analysis of this project.

Chronic illness: An organizing committee for a study on chronic illness, subsidized by the United Better Health Foundation with an initial \$5,000 and a contemplated \$50,000 a year for 3 years, is developing a project design. The five committee members are drawn from the county health department and divisions of health and senior citizens of the welfare planning council.

The Greater Miami Jewish Federation is also participating in a national study of chronic illness financed by the U.S. Public Health Service.

SOME COMMUNITY PROJECTS

Metropolitan government: Metro is Dade County's new top administrative structure and is presently setting policy for hospitals and welfare which, in relation to our senior citizens, holds the promise of much good. Information on needs is being exchanged with the health department. The government department and the university's bureau of business and economic research have completed a report, done at the instance

of the Ford Foundation, on the factors in the creation and development of Metro.

The University of Miami School of Medicine has many projects concerning research in the field of aging.

Sight conservation program for the elderly: This is presently being undertaken through cooperative efforts of the Lions Club, the University of Miami, and the county health department.

Rehabilitation program: In a project supported by the polio foundation, school of medicine students at Jackson Memorial Hospital are engaged in a study involving 125 patients with fractured hips and 150 patients suffering strokes. The county health department is also participating.

Part-time employment of the elderly: While the Miami Chamber of Commerce conducts an educational campaign among employers and the State employment service is active, a great need for work in this area remains unmet. The Lutherans are laying employment plans in connection with their housing project. Discussions on the subject are continuing.

Retirement hotels: Interviews of 400 guests have been made. The role of the retirement hotel—likely to grow in importance hereabouts—is under study.

Psychology: Dr. Granville Fisher, chairman of the Psychology Department, University of Miami, and member of the senior citizens division, has applied for a \$109,720 grant from the National Institute of Mental Health for a program involving teaching, training, and research in gerontology.

What happens here in Dade County in the next decade is certain to shape the destiny of the region for a long time to come. To give proper direction, there are the assets of a flexible and novel metro government, a university deeply involved in all facets of civic life, and a welfare planning council engaged in self-study and a tailoring of services to emerging needs.

The pioneer public housing project I have discussed is the first of its kind in the Southeastern United States. It will include single bedroom and efficiency apartments; the design calls for wider doors for wheelchairs and walking aids, safety bars in bathrooms, signaling devices so neighbors can be summoned in emergencies, low cabinets, ranges and ovens, lower steps and ramps. The units are designed for easy access from one room to another and architects are developing the outside design to provide easy methods of garbage and trash disposal. Included in the housing center also is a community recreation building, also designed for the aged, which will be open to all senior citizens, whether they live at the center or not. To be eligible for housing, an applicant must have lived in Florida for 1 year, in the county for 6 months, and one member of the family must be over 65; the minimum rent, \$20 a month, includes utilities and all kitchen equipment.

I am proud to discuss this program with the Members of the House. I am vigorous in my support of the pilot program which the committee has wisely

called for in its bill. I have already communicated to the Housing Administrator my belief that in view of the high concentration of elderly in the Fourth District of Florida and in view of the pioneer program which the community has already researched, planned, and is now programming, Miami is ideally suited as a site for participation in the test program which the committee expects the administration to get underway during this coming fiscal year with the funds provided in this bill.

We have the problem in south Florida—we also have the people, governmental, educational and civic bodies united in efforts to solve it. The time is ripe for quick assistance and healthy encouragement from the Federal Government to give nonprofit organizations an opportunity to participate.

I hope all of the Members will support the committee's recommendations for this appropriation.

I take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, Mr. THOMAS of Texas and the members of his committee for their favorable consideration of the public building project at Miami, Fla.

This Federal building has been long-planned by GSA and is well conceived. This committee approval for construction will save the taxpayers many thousands of dollars annually and will likewise tremendously improve and make far more efficient operation and management of the many Federal departments located in our area. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy in making this time available to me.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I should also like to congratulate the gentleman and his committee for including this \$5 million for building housing for the elderly. I think it is a great step in the right direction. However, I could not let this opportunity pass without registering my own chagrin that we stopped at \$5 million. I am not at all convinced that we are dealing with this in any adequate way and I am disappointed that this was not included in the budget request. This merely manifests again the total lack of understanding by the administration that this is the No. 1 problem today, the care of our aged and senior citizens.

I feel that we ought to include \$50 million as was recommended in the authorization bill we passed last year. The committee at that time had given a great deal of study to this whole subject and they included a recommendation of \$50 million. At the appropriate time, unless there are compelling arguments to the contrary, I am going to offer an amendment to restore the full \$50 million, because in my district and all over the country we have great need of housing for our elderly citizens.

I congratulate the committee for making a good start in this direction, but I hope the bill when it passes will contain the full \$50 million.

Mr. YATES. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. We share his interest in this vital area and want action. Yes, the committee would have liked to inaugurate the total \$50 million program, but we felt it should follow this pilot study. Pilot studies in each of the sections of the country will lay the foundation for the future for the total program.

I agree with the gentleman that the time is long past when this should have had the attention of Congress. We should have devoted ourselves to the program many years ago. As a matter of fact I have been urging the Congress to take action to help our aging citizens since I have been in the Congress.

Now we have at long last made a start on this program. The committee has overruled administrative inaction. This is not the end of the program. It is the beginning. We expect that it will be carried on and expanded in the future.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. PUCINSKI. While I congratulate the committee on making a good start and having the courage to make the appropriation outside of the budget request, I do not think \$5 million will go very far even with the pilot program.

Mr. YATES. May I say to the gentleman that \$5 million goes much farther than no million dollars as the administration recommended.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct. But we have in America today 16 million people on social security. Let me cite one example. On my desk is a letter from a family, a man and wife, receiving a total of \$130 in social security benefits monthly. Their rent right now is \$75 a month, and they have been served notice that the rent is going up another \$5. That shows the overwhelming magnitude of this problem. It is a monumental one.

Mr. YATES. I appreciate the gentleman's interest and his zeal. May I say to him that housing for the elderly has been on the books for several years, but there has been no action. We want to get the program rolling, and that is the reason that the committee is putting \$5 million in this bill. I think there is a question as to whether HHFA can profitably use the \$50 million. It has not done very much in this field up to the present time. I am as interested as the gentleman in the problems of our aged citizens, and shall support the action of the committee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I merely point out that I am well aware of the sincerity of the committee and the deep interest the gentleman has in this entire problem of housing for the aged. I think it is wonderful the committee has made a start in that direction; however, I will offer my amendment at the appropriate time to raise it to \$50 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. YATES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I want to concur in the splendid remarks of my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

The Federal Power Commission has for a long time failed in its obligation to regulate in the public interest.

As a matter of fact, it has countenanced and permitted gas rate increases which bilk the consumer in a manner almost approaching larceny by license. The Natural Gas Act, designed to protect the public, has been administratively repealed.

Today the gas and oil industry scored a tremendous victory in its struggle for no regulation by bringing about the ouster of William R. Connole, the one publicly spirited member of the Federal Power Commission. Commissioner Connole apparently made one tragic mistake in the execution of his official duties—he considered them a public trust.

When resolute men of courage and public responsibility are forced out of office by the industries they are supposed to be impartially regulating, the time has come for an indignant public to clean house.

My community of Cleveland, as well as the other populous sections of America which require natural gas from the Southwest for space heat, has suffered a terrible loss in the President's outrageous decision not to reappoint Commissioner Connole. Congress would do well to abolish the Federal Power Commission and start off all over again.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

(Mr. JONAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration appropriates \$8,146,167,400 of the taxpayer's money and therefore should be of the utmost importance to the peoples' representatives in Congress. The bill represents almost one-tenth of the total money that will be appropriated for fiscal year 1961 and therefore deserves careful consideration by those of us who have been selected by the people as custodians of their tax dollars and as trustees to determine how they shall be spent.

The members of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, which has primary responsibility in making these determinations, have not taken their responsibilities lightly. Under the able leadership of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], assisted by the able gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], and with the help of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES], and the gentleman from North Carolina now speaking, the subcommittee conducted hearings on this bill beginning on January 18, 1960, and extending through March 31, 1960. The subcommittee heard a total of 354 witnesses and their testimony is contained in three volumes of printed material 6 inches thick and containing 2,917 pages.

The funds appropriated in the bill before you will finance the operations of the following 19 independent offices and agencies of the Government during the fiscal year which begins July 1, 1960:

Civil Aeronautics Board.
Civil Service Commission.
Federal Aviation Agency.
Federal Communications Commission.
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.
Federal Power Commission.
Federal Trade Commission.
General Accounting Office.
General Services Administration.
Housing and Home Finance Agency and its constituent agencies: Public Housing Administration, Federal Housing Administration, and Federal National Mortgage Association.
Interstate Commerce Commission.
Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
National Capital Housing Authority.
National Science Foundation.
Renegotiation Board.
Securities and Exchange Commission.
Selective Service System.
Veterans' Administration.

The importance of these independent agencies is self-evident from a mere recital of their names and I therefore do not believe it necessary to remind members of the committee that this bill is important to every district in the United States.

A bill which provides the operating funds for such widespread operations naturally will be somewhat controversial. I doubt if any seven Members of House would agree in every particular with its terms. There are just too many areas for possible disagreement to ever expect 100-percent approval on the part of any committee. But if I have learned anything during the 8 years I have served in this body, it is that no individual can have his own way all of the time. Legislation is necessarily the result of compromise and adjustment of views to the realities of the existing situation. The bill before you for consideration today therefore is the product of compromise and adjustment of the individual views of seven of your colleagues. It is the result of many hours of discussion, deliberation, and consideration of conflicting viewpoints and the result represents the collective judgment of the subcommittee on the question of how much money should be appropriated to run a multitude of important activities. If I had been writing this bill alone, I would have made deeper cuts in some areas than did the subcommittee and I confess that in other areas I would have provided more funds than are provided in the bill. Nevertheless, I support the action of the subcommittee, as approved by the full committee, because I believe it represents the best judgment of the Members after having debated and considered the subject matter at great length. Lest the comment just made should be misunderstood, let me hasten to say that the differences within the committee were relatively minor and small when compared with the totals in-

involved in this bill. As a member of the subcommittee who attended all of the hearings and listened to all of the witnesses testify, I can conscientiously report that, in my judgment, adequate and sufficient funds are provided for each of the agencies involved and that none will suffer from lack of adequate financing. As the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee stated in his opening remarks, we submit the bill to you as the best we could do with a difficult problem. We present it to you therefore as the unanimous judgment of your subcommittee.

The committee has provided the Members with a printed report containing 29 pages. These pages contain a detailed explanation of the actions taken by the subcommittee. It shows the budget estimate in each case and the action of the committee thereon. It compares amounts appropriated in the bill with the budget estimates and with funds appropriated last year for each individual agency. The total amount appropriated in the bill is \$8,146,167,400, as contrasted with a total of \$7,037,807,200 appropriated last year, or an increase over 1960 appropriations of \$1,108,360,000, but a decrease of \$270,729,600 in the budget estimates.

In all frankness, it should be said that some of these cuts may not stand up in the long run because they are based upon guesswork and will have to be revised during the forthcoming fiscal year if the committee guess proves to be wrong.

For example, the bill carries an appropriation of \$60 million for payment of subsidies to air carriers. This represents a cut of \$8,984,000 in the estimate made by the Civil Aeronautics Board of the amount that will be required to discharge the legal obligations of the Government for air carrier subsidies.

It should be remembered that in paying these subsidies, the Civil Aeronautics Board is carrying out the mandate of Congress in legislation previously enacted. If the subsidy is earned, the Civil Aeronautics Board must pay it and Congress is obligated to provide the money. It is an obligation of the Government and if in this bill we appropriate less than the amount required this year to liquidate obligations, some future Congress will have to make up the difference.

It should be noted for the record that only 13 local service carriers, 5 carriers serving Alaska, and 3 helicopter operations are currently receiving subsidies. All domestic trunkline and international carriers are in a nonsubsidized status, most of them having been subsidy-free since 1957.

Another example of guesswork is the case of the appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for compensation and pensions for veterans. There is no way to provide firm figures as to how much will be required for this purpose in a future fiscal year. All the VA can do is estimate the amount that will be required and all the committee can do is either accept that estimate in toto or use its own best judgment in estimating the amount that will be required. This is considered guesswork.

although it is based upon past experience and all available information. The VA estimated that \$3,840 million will be required to discharge claims for compensation and pensions for veterans in 1961. The committee approved \$3,800 million, or a reduction of \$40 million in the estimate. The committee feels that, since the amount appropriated is one-half a billion dollars more than the amount expected to be spent in fiscal year 1960, it should be sufficient to take care of obligations arising in 1961. However, if this considered guess turns out to be wrong, Congress next year will be required to make up the deficit. So long as the law remains on the books, and veterans qualify for compensation and pensions, the Congress is obligated to appropriate the necessary money.

NATIONAL CAPITAL AIRPORT

As all of you know, the Government is in the position of operating commercial airports. The Washington National Airport is an example and I believe the members of the Committee of the Whole will be interested in knowing how the Government is making out on that operation. The total net Government investment in the airport is \$32.6 million. Revenues earned through 1960 amount to \$31.9 million of which \$22.8 million have been used for operation and maintenance, leaving a balance of \$9.1 million to be applied to the reduction of the investment. This means that the net investment of the Government in the airport is now down to \$23.5 million.

During the last 5 years, passenger traffic using the Washington National Airport increased by 72 percent and aircraft movements increased by 50 percent. In calendar year 1959, more than 5 million airline passengers were enplaned and deplaned at this airport. That is more than 9 passengers every minute of every day and night for 365 days and nights. During this same period, a total of 312,000 aircraft take-offs and landings were made at this single airport.

Revenues to the airport during fiscal year 1960 will amount to \$3,922,000, of which landing fees account for \$632,000, plus \$72,000 for ramp service, or a total of \$704,000 for aircraft use. The remaining income was derived from concessions, rentals and utilities.

The projected cost of the Dulles International Airport now under construction near Chantilly, Va., is \$85 million. The estimate is that this investment will require 40 years for recovery. Operations are scheduled to begin July 1, 1961.

It has become a practice in recent years for people to downgrade the United States in comparison with Russia. Many people have therefore been led to believe that within a few years we will be far behind the Communists in industrial production. When officials of the Federal Power Commission were before the subcommittee, some questions were directed to them in order to develop a comparison with Russia and the United States in the production of electric energy. Based upon the figures given the subcommittee by the Federal Power Commission, the margin in favor of the United States is substantial and

is steadily growing. Our margin over Russia in the production of electric energy has increased from 297 billion kilowatt-hours in 1950 to 529 billion kilowatt-hours in 1959. It is estimated that by 1975 this margin will have gone beyond 900 billion kilowatt-hours. Following is a table which shows a comparison of the total capacity of electric generating plants and the production of electric energy in the United States and Russia for the period 1902-59:

Total capacity of electric generating plants and production of electric energy in the United States and Russia (including industrial)

Year	United States ¹		U.S.S.R. ²	
	Capacity megawatts	Production million kilowatt-hours	Capacity megawatts	Production million kilowatt-hours
1902	2,987	5,969		1,900
1907	6,809	14,121		
1912	10,980	24,752		
1917	15,494	43,429		
1920		56,559		
1921		53,125		
1922	20,468	61,204		
1923		71,399		
1924		75,892		
1925		84,666		
1926		94,222		
1927	34,574	101,390		
1928		108,069	1,874	5,000
1929		116,747		6,200
1930		114,637		8,400
1931		109,373		10,700
1932	42,849	99,359	4,630	13,500
1933		102,655		16,400
1934		110,404		21,000
1935		118,935	6,830	26,300
1936	43,582	136,006		32,800
1937	44,370	146,476		38,200
1938	46,873	141,935	8,700	39,400
1939	49,438	161,308		43,200
1940	50,962	179,907	11,000	48,30
1941	53,695	208,306		
1942	57,237	233,146		
1943	60,539	267,540		
1944	62,066	279,525		
1945	62,868	271,255	10,700	43,300
1946	63,006	269,609		48,600
1947	65,151	307,400		56,500
1948	69,615	336,809	18,000	66,300
1949	76,570	345,066	20,000	78,300
1950	82,850	388,674	22,400	91,200
1951	90,127	433,358	23,500	104,000
1952	97,312	463,035	25,250	119,100
1953	107,354	514,169	28,602	134,400
1954	118,885	544,645	32,815	150,695
1955	130,414	624,902	37,236	170,225
1956	137,342	684,804	43,350	191,653
1957	146,221	716,356	48,350	209,480
1958	160,651	724,752	53,000	233,000
1959 (preliminary)		790,000	59,000	261,600

¹ From Historical Statistics of the United States for Years 1902-38. Data for later years are from Federal Power Commission statistics.

² From the United Nations, Economic Commission for Europe, Electrical World, Electrical Engineering, and various other sources.

MOTOR POOL OPERATION

Public Law 152 of the 83d Congress authorized the General Services Administration to establish and operate inter-agency motor vehicle pools. By the end of 1959, 44 such pools had been established and were in operation. GSA proposes to establish 14 additional motor pools in 1960, and 12 additional pools in 1961, to bring the total up to 70, at which time it is estimated that the program will be saving the U.S. taxpayers approximately \$6 million per year.

I am particularly interested in this program because I was the author of the legislation which authorized the establishment and operation of the pools. Each year General Services Administra-

tion, in its budget presentation to our subcommittee, makes a detailed report on the operation of these motor vehicle pools and when the bill is under consideration in the Committee of the Whole I usually make a progress report for the information of the Members.

The ownership and operation of the fleet of Government-owned motor vehicles is really big business. The Government-owned motor vehicle fleet, not counting combat and tactical motor vehicles of the Armed Forces, is valued at approximately \$500 million and includes approximately 225,000 motor vehicles as compared with 260,000 in 1954 when the motor pool operation was inaugurated. These motor vehicles travel approximately 2 billion miles per year and use in excess of 300 million gallons of fuel. Operation, maintenance, and replacement costs amount to more than \$290 million per year.

It is obvious from these astronomical figures that an opportunity exists to save vast sums of money by the practice of economies and efficiencies. By establishing interagency pools in areas where there is a heavy concentration of Government activity, such as New York, Washington, Chicago, San Francisco, and so forth, substantial savings have resulted. The savings result not only from reduced requirements of motor vehicles for Government agencies but by increasing the utilization of existing vehicles which permits three cars to accomplish the work formerly requiring four cars and by consolidating management and controlling maintenance.

General Services Administration officials testifying on this subject before the subcommittee presented evidence indicating that during the last fiscal year total savings from motor pool operations amounted to \$5 million and that by the end of 1961, when the total pools are expected to reach 70, the annual savings will be \$6 million per year.

The testimony further revealed that a full year's operation of the 33 pools established by June 30, 1958, resulted in a decrease of 21.5 percent in the number of vehicles required to perform agency workload requirements, an increase of 2,407 miles per vehicle and a reduction of 3.59 cents in cost per mile. The cumulative savings during the 1954-58 period amounted to \$5.9 million. By the end of 1959, when 44 pools were in operation, the cumulative savings amounted to \$10.5 million. By the end of 1960, when 58 pools are expected to be in operation, the expected cumulative savings will be \$15.8 million. By the end of 1961, when 70 pools will have been established, the estimated annual savings will be \$6 million.

Savings during the period 1954 through 1960 therefore will amount to \$15.8 million. This is not a substantial sum when compared with \$80 billion budgets but it was worth saving and indicates how savings can be made by concerted effort and a soundly-conceived program. The officials of General Services Administration are entitled to high praise for an efficient and money-saving operation.

PROPERTY UTILIZATION

The Federal Government owns more real and personal property than any organization or government in the world. Much of it was required during the war years and every year substantial amounts are being declared excess to the needs of the Government and are being disposed of by GSA.

General Services Administration will return \$50 million in cash to the Treasury in 1960 from sales of real property. It is estimated that \$55 million will be returned in 1961 from additional sales. Expenses, including broker fees, are running at about \$2 million per year. While these returns are substantial, the record shows that the Government is sustaining heavy losses as a result of these sales. The acquisition cost of the property disposed of in fiscal year 1960 was \$500 million so the return is only about 10 cents on the dollar. Critics point to this low return and charge that the property is not being wisely or prudently handled. The subcommittee explored that allegation with GSA officials and were assured that in every instance sales exceed current appraisals and that the average recovery is about 115 percent of the present fair market value of the property.

You may wonder why Government-owned property goes down in value while apparently all other property is constantly going up. The explanation is simple and should be understood. The answer is that in most instances the property offered for sale was constructed for a special purpose and is not suitable for ordinary commercial or industrial use without excessive costs of conversion. An example was cited of an industrial-type property in West Virginia which cost the Government \$86 million. It has been surplus for several years and GSA has been trying, without any success at all, to obtain bids for it. If you know of anybody in the market for such a property, it is recommended that you get in touch with GSA.

There is another property in Chicago with 100 acres under roof, the largest plant in the world. The Government's investment there is \$120 million and a profitable sale will be difficult because of the conversion cost. Since it may be difficult to dispose of this property for its fair market value, GSA is considering all possibilities of utilizing it for some needed Government activity.

On the other hand, another example cited by GSA is the so-called Studebaker Building in Chicago. This is a very fine, modern building and GSA testified that it has a high market value and will bring a good price. The subcommittee was agreeably surprised to hear Mr. Floete testify that this property is too valuable for the Government to use and that GSA therefore proposes to offer it for sale and expects the Government to recover the full acquisition cost. This attitude is contrary to that usually attributed to agency heads who generally are charged with clinging onto the valuable properties and being willing only to relinquish the unsuitable. But Mr. Floete is an outstanding example of a fine public servant who seems

genuinely interested in conducting an efficient and economical operation.

SURPLUS PERSONAL PROPERTY

The disposal of surplus personal property also presents great difficulties. Critics also point to the low return being received in the disposal of personal property, but it should be remembered that much of this property consists of obsolete combat aircraft, artillery guns, and war material which has a very low salable value. Since relatively little is to be gained by selling this property at a fraction of its cost, the subcommittee has been encouraging GSA to step up its utilization program. Whenever GSA can provide agency requirements with surplus personal property already owned by the Government instead of procuring new property, substantial savings result. This utilization program is working out very well for the Government. In 1959, for example, GSA was able to transfer \$141 million of this surplus property to civilian agencies of the Government in lieu of purchasing new equipment. It is expected that this amount will go up in 1960 to \$215 million and in 1961 to \$305 million. This results in substantial savings in procurement.

You are all familiar with the Government's donation program. In 1955, I had the privilege of serving on a special subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations under the chairmanship of the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], which made substantial revisions in the donable property program. Amendments to the act proposed by that subcommittee, and approved by the full committee, were unanimously adopted by the House on March 17, 1955. I think it is safe to say that these amendments have been of inestimable value to the educational public health, and civilian defense agencies in the country. Donations to these nonprofit organizations in 1959 amounted to \$361 million and are expected to rise to \$450 million in 1960 and to \$550 million in 1961.

While the Government does not realize any return in dollars from the donable program, there should be universal satisfaction in seeing substantial quantities of this surplus property finding its way into the hands of our needy educational and health institutions instead of being thrown on the market for sale at a fraction of acquisition cost.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very much interested in what my friend had to say about the General Services Administration. I want to compliment Mr. Floete. I consider him to be one of the finest gentlemen I have ever met, and certainly one of the finest public officials I have ever met in my many years of public life. He is a dedicated gentleman and public official in every respect, eminently fair. The administration of the program of the General Services Administration under Mr. Floete has been very effective and efficient, about the best humanly possible.

There is another activity in which the gentleman from North Carolina and I participated in addition to the surplus property program. That was to see that the General Services Administration got enough money to protect the Government as a consumer of telephone service and electricity and services of that kind. The people of the country are indebted to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and the members of his subcommittees for giving the necessary money for that purpose. As the result, the Government and the taxpayers have been saved many millions of dollars, and private users have been the beneficiaries as well as the Government as users of those services.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman agree with the comment I made that while we do not receive any dollar return from this enormous amount of personal property that is donated we do derive many intangible benefits. There are many schools and hospitals that would have difficulty operating if it were not for this program.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

The evidence before the passage of the bill that came out of the subcommittee of which I was chairman and of which the gentleman from North Carolina was a member showed that the Defense Department got around the Donable Property Act by declaring property to be excess rather than surplus. We tightened that up. I do not say that in any unkind or critical sense. We tightened that up and the property beneficiaries receive is based upon acquisition value to the Government, and it is worth 100 cents on the dollar to the schools, colleges, and other beneficiaries, and it has rendered inestimable service to these institutions who are the beneficiaries.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts and concur in his comments concerning the high quality of service rendered this Government by Mr. Floete. The members of our subcommittee are aware of the fine work he has done, and we have complimented him in person and in the RECORD.

SPACE

Recent spectacular successes in satellite launchings have taken most of the steam out of the charges that the United States is lagging far behind Russia in this field. The subcommittee had before it some of the scientists in charge of NASA's program and I should like to commend to your examination the testimony of Dr. Glennan, Dr. Dryden, Dr. Silverstein, and Dr. von Braun. You will find their testimony set forth in part III of the hearings beginning on page 173. For the benefit of those who will read this RECORD but who will not have an opportunity to read the testimony given by the subcommittee, I will include as a part of my remarks today some of the exchanges between subcommittee members and these witnesses:

Mr. OSTERTAG. Dr. Glennan, how do we compare with Russia in all factors? We recognize that they have a thrust greater than ours; but, overall, how do we stand?

Dr. GLENNAN. Every morning at 8, I stand before the mirror and say, "We are behind the Russians in total thrust available to us,

the level of thrust in our first stage boosters. In all other areas it is my considered opinion that we are not behind the Russians, that we are the equal or the better of the Russians."

I arrive at this conclusion from discussions with capable scientists and from the fact that we have published much more information from the probes that we have sent out in little bits of packages than they have from their tremendously large gadgets.

Mr. YATES. May I ask you then how do you account for Von Braun's statement where he says we are 2 or 3 years behind the Russians?

Dr. GLENNAN. Dr. von Braun works in the rocket field. He is talking about the thrust of the rocket, and nothing else.

He may have guidance in mind, as well, because he has not been able to carry the guidance that he would like to carry, which he thinks he has on his shelves. He is not certain that this is quite as good as he might want it to be, because he has not had the opportunity to test it in flight.

Mr. YATES. If, when Dr. von Braun comes in here, and I ask him what he means by his statement, he is going to tell me we are 3 years behind the Russians in thrust and nothing more.

Dr. GLENNAN. You ask him and see what he will answer.

Dr. GLENNAN. I was not being facetious because this is a serious business with us. The business of trying to have people understand where we stand in the various elements of this program is tremendously important to me. If I seem a little emphatic about it, I think you will understand.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I think we should be grateful for your emphasis, but what I was trying to bring into focus was the fact that you have had certain successes and you have had certain developments take place and you have a pretty good measurement of what they have done. I believe it is generally conceded that insofar as power or thrust, Russia has achieved that beyond your capability to date.

Dr. GLENNAN. At the present time.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In the overall picture, taking all things into account, our successes and our developments in many respects exceed theirs and/or equal it, and in only one field or one area of this thing are they recognized as being ahead, is that right?

Dr. GLENNAN. That is my statement, sir.

Mr. JONAS. When along that list do you say you will have reached the point you are seeking with respect to thrust?

Mr. OSTERTAG. The timetable on the Saturn? Is that it?

Mr. JONAS. Why can't you skip some of those stages?

General OSTRANDER. Skip some of these?

Mr. JONAS. Yes, and start working on Saturn.

General OSTRANDER. Simply because these will come in earlier than the Saturn is available. There are many things we can do with a smaller payload capacity.

Mr. JONAS. You could not speed up Saturn by concentrating on it?

General OSTRANDER. No, sir. We have speeded up Saturn as much as we can right now.

Dr. DRYDEN. The problem is the one I mentioned. Of course, we already have the Delta. That was a decision made early in 1959. Those vehicles are just beginning to be delivered. They are the things we will be firing over the next year. The alternative is to sit by and do nothing until Saturn comes along.

Mr. JONAS. The work on these intermediate stages is not slowing up the work on Saturn?

Dr. DRYDEN. No. They enable us to do something now.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Their objectives are somewhat different?

Dr. DRYDEN. They carry smaller payloads.

Mr. OSTERTAG. What they seek to achieve is different?

General OSTRANDER. I would like to emphasize we are always going to need a sort of a fleet of trucks. In other words, it would not pay to use the Saturn for some experiment where we only needed to carry, say, 2,000 or 3,000 pounds.

Therefore, what we are trying to do is develop as a comparison, let us say, a half-ton truck, 2-ton truck, 2½-ton truck, and 5-ton truck.

Dr. GLENNAN. I would point out, I think, in this same area, the Vega was canceled so we would not duplicate another vehicle of essentially the same general capabilities and weightlifting and mission capability.

* * * STATEMENT OF DR. VON BRAUN ON THE SATURN PROGRAM * * *

Mr. THOMAS. Dr. von Braun, tell us about your Saturn program. How are you getting along, what are your many headaches, and what are your hopes and aspirations?

Dr. VON BRAUN. We consider the Saturn project as a project of greatest national importance and urgency because we think it is our only bet to beat the Russians in the payload capability.

I think we have proven that in the payload area and also the capability of obtaining high speeds we are probably almost on a par with the Russians today; in fact, this transmitting equipment beats anything the Russians have even tried to do.

However, in the big rocket area, in the booster area, we are still definitely behind.

Our opinion is that the Saturn booster is at least twice as powerful as the most powerful booster the Russians have thus far employed. We do not know, of course, what they are developing.

* * * Dr. VON BRAUN. Also liquid hydrogen. * * *

In this connection I would like to make a general remark about how the Saturn is faring in general under the NASA administration.

Immediately after the Saturn project was transferred to NASA, Dr. Glennan appointed a special committee under the chairmanship of Dr. Silverstein to determine this upper stage configuration.

Up to then various competitive ideas had been kicked around, such as just the use of a standard Titan, perhaps with a Centaur top stage, but all this did not look attractive because there would have been a lot of new engineering involved. At the same time the performance was not satisfactory.

The Silverstein committee took up this job of determining the upper stages on the 17th of November, and on December 31, 1959, it came up with a final recommendation. The final recommendation is what you see here, with the C-1 and C-2 configurations.

Dr. DRYDEN. This was a committee with Defense membership. It was a joint committee of NASA and Defense to make this decision.

Dr. VON BRAUN. I also would like to point out that we were happy to be represented on that committee and we were very happy with the final recommendation. In fact, it was a unanimous choice.

On the other hand, we should point out this is a bold choice because liquid hydrogen is a brandnew propellant and has a lot of characteristics we are not too familiar with, so it is a bold choice, but the payoff will be great.

* * * Mr. YATES. May I ask you a question, Dr. von Braun?

ADEQUACY OF FUNDS REQUESTED FOR SATURN

You talk in terms of saving a year by an additional appropriation. Previous statements I had seen attributed to you had indicated we were several years behind the Russians in terms of engine capability. Will the amount of money that is being requested here help eradicate that lag in your judgment, or should we make more available? Will the provision of more money do it, or is this amount adequate for the job?

Dr. VON BRAUN. I do not believe that we could intelligently spend much more money on Saturn. At least we could do nothing but shall we say try parallel approaches and do this kind of thing that may buy us a little more assurance, but I do not think we could buy time with more money. And to answer your question of whether this is enough to catch up with the Russians, we have to know how fast the Russians are running, and this I do not know.

Mr. YATES. This is true, of course, but you had indicated we were years behind the Russians and while it is true, we do not know how fast the Russians are moving, presumably their rate of progress will be as great as it was in the past. Will our rate be speeded up sufficiently so that in time we can catch them?

Dr. VON BRAUN. Well, I think I cannot go much further than just to say I do not see any possibility of speeding up the Saturn beyond this 1 year, no matter how much money you would swamp on us. One could try a parallel approach and develop another booster and thereby playing it safe in case the Saturn should hit a major snag, but otherwise, I do not see—

Mr. YATES. I am sure your statements in the past made many people feel quite concerned about the gap that exists between the stage of our research and the Russian's. Are we doing enough to catch up, are we doing enough to overcome the lag? When you limit your answer to Saturn, does that cover your entire viewpoint? Do you have opinions as to what we should be doing in other activities than Saturn in order to make up the distance?

Dr. VON BRAUN. Saturn involves, of course, elements such as hydrogen upper stages where very considerable fundamental work must be done which cannot be speeded up beyond a certain pace. Beyond that, we hope to go to the nuclear stages, but here again we are confronted with problems where first, as Dr. Dryden pointed out, more knowledge must be acquired.

For example, the Plumbrook facility near Cleveland is to provide basic knowledge on reactors and problems like heat transfer in reactors, and so forth.

Mr. YATES. Can I safely say for the record that in your judgment the request that is being made here for the experiments to be undertaken is as much as we can do at the present time?

Dr. VON BRAUN. Yes, sir. I think by and large this is the case. I may add one little remark, though. I was a little frightened when I heard this morning that elimination of our engineering and office buildings for Huntsville is seriously under consideration. I think if these construction projects at Huntsville would not be approved, this would really set us back.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

(Mr. EVINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the largest and one of the most important of the annual appropriation bills considered by the Congress. In this bill

we are providing funds for services and activities which will influence and affect in one way or another almost every citizen in our Nation.

Included in this bill also are funds for agencies whose activities are vital for the very survival of our Nation.

Your subcommittee on independent agencies held hearings on this bill for some 2 months and the members have taken an additional month to study the testimony and to evaluate in detail the needs of these agencies for which funds are carried in this bill, which we are considering here today.

At the outset, I should like to say that the tremendous task of holding these extended hearings was handled most ably by our colleague and friend, the genial gentleman from Texas, Chairman ALBERT THOMAS. As always he has done a most outstanding job and rendered a great public service. There are some Members, as we all know, who are truly dedicated—dedicated to the public interest—and this country is better for the lives and services of such Members as ALBERT THOMAS.

That we have been able to scrutinize the activities and the proposals of these 18 great Government agencies in this rather brief period is a great tribute to the knowledge, tact, and leadership of our able colleague, AL THOMAS, who serves as chairman of the subcommittee. It has been a great pleasure to be associated with Chairman THOMAS and with all the members of our subcommittee—the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG], the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, and all our colleagues—Congressmen SIDNEY YATES, EDWARD BOLAND, CHARLES JONAS, and JOHN RHODES.

This bill, as it comes to you today, represents the efforts of the committee to insure that the agencies concerned shall have sufficient funds to discharge their functions effectively and efficiently but without extravagance or unnecessary frills.

We all know that all agencies have a perhaps natural tendency to over estimate their needs and requirements. We have tried in our considerations of this bill to eliminate only those items which are not strictly vital or necessary or which can be postponed without any significant effect on the public interest.

This bill carries appropriations for 18 independent boards, bureaus, commissions, and agencies—including the Civil Service Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, Federal Trade Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission—the FCC, FPC, the Veterans' Administration, the General Services Administration, the National Science Foundation, the Federal Aviation Agency, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

We should remember that most of these agencies and specifically the regulatory agencies are not agencies of the executive branch but in a real sense agencies of the Congress.

The Congress established them in the first place and in a sense as deputies to administer in detail the functions of regulation which the Constitution places

in the hands of the Congress. It is true that there has been a tendency during recent years for these agencies to stray away from this fundamental tie and in some instances even to disregard the intent of the law under which they operate.

But I am pleased to report that there has been a great improvement in most of the agencies in the past 2 or 3 years and certainly we have the responsibility to encourage further improvement in the effectiveness of these agencies by giving them the means to discharge their responsibility to the Congress, to the Nation, and to all of the people.

The total appropriation recommendation carried in this bill is \$8,146,167,400 for all agencies. This sum represents a cut or reduction of \$270,729,600 carried in the Budget, but an increase of \$1,108,360,200 over the 1960 appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, time will not permit a detailed discussion of all items for each of the agencies and commissions concerned. I do, however, wish to direct my remarks to the fund requests of three of the agencies coming before our subcommittee. These represent the biggest items—the largest amounts—carried in the bill.

NASA

The reductions recommended in this bill would have been considerably greater except for the fact that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is receiving an increase of a large order—about 75 percent. This is a very large increase—the largest I believe for any agency of our Government.

In a real sense this increase represents the price we are paying today for being pennywise and dollar-foolish a few years ago. It is the price we are paying for our complacency, for our failure to rise to the challenge of the space age in our traditional American way, and for our slowness in recognizing the tremendous progress and capabilities of Soviet Russia in this the space, missile, and rocket age—in this vital field.

There are those who still do not seem to see any urgency in this matter. I am sorry that all of our colleagues were not privileged to hear the testimony of Dr. Keith Glennan, NASA Administrator, and the scientists who are carrying on the work of this most important agency.

Apparently, the Budget Bureau does not appear to appreciate fully the importance and vital necessity of accelerated progress in this field. It has been very gratifying to note that the scientists who are in charge of this program have a full awareness of the importance to our prestige and even survival as a nation in the work they are doing.

They are dedicated men and although they are undoubtedly handicapped by the lack of enthusiasm in high places for their mission, I feel personally that we have entrusted this work in capable hands and that if we will provide them with the means to do their job as they want to do it, we can have reason to be confident that our deficiencies will be corrected and the advantage that Soviet Russia may enjoy at present will be erased.

Let me point out that part of the increase in funds is not an increase but a transfer. As we know, during the past year, the brilliant team of scientists headed by Dr. von Braun—formerly with the Army and stationed at Redstone Arsenal in Alabama—has been transferred to NASA.

The facilities and personnel at Redstone have been transferred to this agency.

In the past, funds for Redstone have been carried in the defense budget. Now we are transferring those funds to NASA. Thus, we have an increase in this bill of some \$60 million for salaries and expenses. The largest part of this represents the salaries and expenses for the Redstone group who are working on the Saturn and other space vehicles.

In this bill we are allocating some \$125 million for construction. Of this, about \$25 million is for equipment and the balance for lands and structures.

The construction program involves additions of various facilities at the various present installations of NASA.

The largest construction expenditures are for the Jet Propulsion Laboratory in Pasadena, the Huntsville, Ala., facility, and the Cape Canaveral facility in Florida, each accounting for about \$25 million.

With very few exceptions the facilities are actual operational facilities and research facilities. There are a few, but very few, items calling for building or adding to already existing administrative buildings.

Our subcommittee has carefully gone over the construction proposals and has approved those which are directly concerned with the mission of this agency and reduced or eliminated those which would merely add to administrative costs and overhead.

We recognize that a vast program such as this needs efficient administration and certainly we desire to provide the means for efficient administration. But where we have to make a choice between funds for operational activities and funds for administrative activities, we have favored the operational activities.

By far the largest part of the funds in the NASA budget is for actual research and development—a total of \$621,453,000—as compared with \$320 million last year and \$171 million in 1959.

This is the part of the budget that is specifically directed at the heart of the mission of NASA. These funds are distributed over a number of programs—\$85 million for scientific investigations in space which covers the scientific satellites, the Lunar and planetary explorations, such as the recent Pioneer V; \$25 million for studying and developing practical applications of satellites, such as the use of satellites for communications, weather forecasting, etc.

The sum of \$100 million is earmarked for the project of sending man into space—the Mercury project; about \$80 million for developing better methods of propulsion in space; and about \$200 million for the development of actual space vehicles. Of this last amount, \$130 million is earmarked for the Saturn

project under the von Braun group to develop a vehicle capable of carrying large payloads into space.

Although this is a large budget, it represents expenditures that we cannot fail to make if we are to excel in this field and have the interest of our Nation at heart.

We Americans are not accustomed to being second best at anything, and certainly we cannot tolerate being second best in this vital field which may well be crucial in the next century.

History shows that it is those nations which pioneer in opening and developing new frontiers which progress and grow in stature and importance. Always it has been those nations who have dared to leave their own present boundaries and venture into the unknown who have become great. This was true of the Assyrians, the Phoenicians, the Greeks, the Romans in ancient times. In modern times it was the Spanish, the Portuguese, and the British who were not afraid to venture into the unknown world who established empires and wrote history. In recent times we Americans have added to history and progress. Americans have always been pioneers in spirit—and courageous. Today we see a new nation, Soviet Russia, taking the lessons of history to heart, while we have had a tendency to stay home and enjoy the comforts of easy living.

Personally, I feel that we Americans have not lost our adventurous and pioneering spirit. I feel that most Americans want to be bold and imaginative and to explore the new frontiers and to contribute to history. They merely want direction and leadership.

Here we are supplying the foundation for a resurgence of the American pioneer spirit. The price may seem high to some today, but it will be very small to our posterity if it preserves and adds to our stature as a nation.

THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Closely related in many respects is the work of the National Science Foundation which is also vital to our future and which is also adventurous and pioneering thought in a different area. Pure science is the basic tool of modern progress.

The sputniks and the general public concern has accelerated the work of the National Science Foundation. Its work is most important. Time was when scientific laws lasted centuries. Today we know they may not last a decade. Just in the past 2 or 3 years, for example, our whole concept of the universe and the basic processes of the universe have had to be modified by the things we have discovered through the penetration of space by satellites. Today we are nearer to the solution of some of the great basic secrets of existence and of life than we ever imagined a few years ago.

Furthermore, the effect that scientific discoveries have on our future is very much more immediate and ominous today than ever in history. I need only cite the terrifying way in which the scientific discovery of how to split and create atoms has affected our recent history and indeed distribution of political power among the nations.

When first announced some 20 years ago the basic discoveries of Fermi and others seemed significant only to a few physicists. They have led, however, to the development of atom and hydrogen bombs—to atomic power. Today they are of frightening significance to every man, woman, and child in the entire world.

It is, therefore, vitally necessary that, as a nation, we encourage and stimulate the greatest possible progress in basic scientific research. The National Science Foundation has been entrusted with this important mission. It is also important in this age when scientists can determine the future of nations that we produce an adequate supply of able and brilliant scientists. This function too has been entrusted to the National Science Foundation.

The budget for the Foundation is also larger this year than last—\$190 million against roughly \$160 million last year. Slightly more than half of these funds are for the primary mission—that of supporting science through grants and contracts for scientific research, largely at universities and other nonprofit basic research facilities.

This portion of the budget also includes funds for disseminating and exchanging scientific information. Every type of scientific research is supported and the funds are distributed about 50 percent in mathematical, physical, and engineering research; about 35 percent in biological and medical research; about 5 percent in social science research, and the balance in such special fields of importance as Antarctic research, research into the possibilities of modifying weather, and so forth. Even though the funds provided for this research are sizable we are told that they will enable the taking care of only about one-third of the proposals received. And though we have increased our support of science in the past few years many important scientific investigations still have been curtailed, delayed, or dropped because funds are not available.

One of the most interesting of the programs that is being supported is the problem of the fundamental nature of living things. The programs of the Foundation in the past are already producing significant clues to this great secret of life. We are getting closer to understanding and even to duplicating the processes by which living matter is produced through physical and chemical action.

Another basic program is concerned with a study of behavior of the fundamental particles of which the universe is made—the atoms. Through these extremely basic studies we have already had highly practical applications. I mention the atom bomb, and nuclear power. More recently we have read of the possibilities of producing electricity directly from chemical and physical behavior of gas plasmas which give promise of entirely new motors for space, and air propulsion and even for automobiles.

Besides research, another important function of the Foundation is that of

supporting the education of scientists. This program is becoming stabilized.

There is only a slight increase in funds for this purpose this year over last year. The largest portion of the funds goes to two activities—20 percent for fellowships to promising students and scientists and 50 percent for in institutes at which teachers of science learn to become more effective teachers. These science institutes or seminars take place all over the country and nearly every teacher of science is having an opportunity to participate in them.

These programs—research and support of science through grants of scholarships and fellowships—is most important today. There is evidence that the program of the NSF has resulted in strengthening our position in science and greatly improved the quality of scientists and scientific teaching. Money spent today on these programs will bring dividends in the future.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman, who is making a fine statement, would agree with me that perhaps the reason the Russians got ahead of us as far as thrust is concerned was the fact that they had not mastered the art of miniaturization as far as the bomb was concerned to the extent that we had and, therefore, needed a larger thrust to carry a bomb; whereas we, having mastered the art of miniaturization, have now used that art to equalize the gap between the Russians and ourselves as far as capabilities and thrust are concerned? In other words, we have by miniaturization been able to put satellites out into space which have done a better and more thorough job than those of the Russians.

Mr. EVINS. I would state to my friend that we were delayed by certain developments, but we are going ahead now and making greater progress in the field of thrust. That is the area in which we are directing our efforts at this time and this is the area in which we are behind. Here is where the gap exists.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That was a point I wanted to make. However, we have been able to achieve capabilities which minimize the disadvantage between the Russians and ourselves as far as thrust is concerned.

Mr. EVINS. I thank my friend from Arizona.

The third interest to which I wish to address my remarks is the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Chairman, the Veterans' Administration accounts for by far the largest single item in this bill—more than \$5 billion. The committee is recommending an appropriation of \$5,397,291,000 for all the VA programs in 1961. This is an increase of \$280,358,000 over last year. This program is important, first, because it affects about one-third of the families of our Nation in one way or another, and, secondly, because through it we are living up to the pledges we made to those who have fought for our

country that we would minimize the sacrifice which they had to make to defend their country.

Again this year the VA budget shows an increase over last year. Most of this increase is the automatic increase which comes about because as our veterans grow older more of them become eligible for the benefits provided by the world's finest veterans' program.

One large increase has been made necessary by the terms of the revised non-service connected pension law we passed last year. As a matter of fact, we have an increase of nearly a half billion dollars for compensation and pensions. On the other hand, we have a continued decrease in the readjustment benefits provided by the GI Bill of Rights and similar legislation. This is coming about because most veterans are exhausting their benefits under this provision. Two years ago the readjustment benefits cost some \$700 million, last year they went down to about \$580 million, and this year they are expected to go down to a little over \$400 million. In other words, this reduction in the budget does not reflect any reduction in the services to which our veterans are entitled.

The lower cost simply is because most veterans have already used up their benefits in this area.

We are recommending an increase in the medical budget for both inpatient and outpatient care. The demands of veterans for medical care are increasing and I am sorry to say that the waiting lists are not being diminished but on the contrary they are increasing.

Sooner or later we must face up to this situation and if we need more medical facilities we will, in my view, have to provide them.

Meanwhile, the hospital construction program is continuing. The committee is recommending approximately \$40 million for hospital construction which is \$7½ million more than last year. The construction program, so long delayed and slowed down, is progressing. I imagine it would progress more rapidly if the Budget Bureau had the same high sense of obligation to the veterans as the Administrator of our veterans program—Administrator Sumner G. Whittier.

We of the committee all agree that he is one of the most able and finest of our several VA Administrators.

We are getting along today at a faster rate on construction and our veterans can look forward to better and more modern hospital facilities in the coming years. This is essential if the growing waiting lists for admission are to be reduced.

We are recording funds also for modernization of present VA hospitals. The bill carries \$20 million for this purpose. It is to be hoped that the Budget Bureau will not further delay improved hospital facilities by delaying the expenditures of the funds that we vote for this purpose today.

The bill carries some slight reductions in administrative costs in the overhead and administrative funds, and not in the important services directly to veterans.

This bill provides for increases and improvements in both services and benefits for our veterans and will in no sense reduce the effectiveness of this great agency serving our Nation's veterans.

I have discussed briefly only three of the important items in this bill.

I should like to add that our committee has scrutinized the budget and fund requests of all the agencies involved carefully, and with the desire to bring about the best balance between maintaining the efficiency of these agencies and the pressing need where we can to economize.

This bill will insure both objectives that those agencies can perform their functions and services effectively and with lowest cost in the public interest. I urge the passage of the bill as recommended by the committee.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EVINS. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] made some rather critical comments about the Federal Power Commission in the gas rate field. I notice on page 206, volume 1, of the hearings, the gentleman from Tennessee, who is now speaking, questioned Mr. Kallina and Mr. Kuykendall about that. I will ask the gentleman if he did not elicit the following information concerning suspensions and rate increases.

On page 206 in response to a question Mr. Kallina stated:

There is a figure here on independent producers. On independent producers during the calendar year 1959 the Commission allowed 33 tax (rate) increases amounting to \$182,000, and the Commission allowed 806 other rate increases without suspension amounting to \$5,430,000, so the total allowed by the Commission during calendar year 1959 was 839 increases aggregating \$5,612,000.

On page 207, in response to another question, it was stated at the time those rates increases were being allowed, the Commission suspended 1,265 cases aggregating \$69.5 million, and in 1958 the Commission suspended 1,064 cases aggregating \$37,612,000.

Then the gentleman from Tennessee said:

That is both sides of the coin and that is a good picture. One year you suspended an amount of \$69 million and the next year \$37 million as compared to the \$5 million and \$7 million of increases.

Mr. EVINS. I do not have before me at the moment the volume referred to by the gentleman, but I do recall the testimony. There have been some gas rate increases and there certainly have been some rate increase suspensions.

Mr. JONAS. We went into the matter with the officials of the Federal Power Commission and the record indicated that they had suspended a considerable amount of rate increases requested far exceeding the amount of rate increases they approved.

Mr. EVINS. The gentleman is correct, as I remember the testimony.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD].

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to comment briefly on the appropriation which I hoped would be in this bill for administrative and personnel expenses of the Civil Defense Administration, which has been a bone of contention for several years. Just to recapitulate for a moment, 2 years ago the Durham bill was passed declaring that the civil defense of the United States is a matter of joint Federal, State, and local responsibility. That act authorized Federal contributions on a 50-50 matching basis for administrative and personnel expenses. Many of us regret that it was impossible in previous years to get the funds thus authorized into this appropriation bill. Each year they were put in by the Senate but resisted in conference by the House conferees, following, I must add, the mandate of the House.

I was pleased when I read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 7 that Senator HAYDEN, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, said—and this was during the discussion in the Senate of the second supplemental appropriation bill—that an informal agreement had been reached with the House conferees that it would be better to handle this in the regular appropriation bill, and that something like \$3 million would probably be in the regular appropriation bill which is before us today. I was disappointed to find that no such amount is provided in this bill. I trust that the Senate will again insert these funds and that this time the House conferees will accept that amendment.

The main reason is very simple, Mr. Chairman. It seems incredible that we will spend \$40 billion to build powerful weapons to try to win a war by killing our enemies, and refuse to spend even a few million dollars to try to win a war by saving the lives of our own people. We can be defeated, or we can encourage war against us by being weak in either of two ways: If an enemy knows that we do not have adequate weapons to strike back decisively, or that we do not have means to protect the lives of our citizens. If we do not have adequate weapons, the enemy can say, "You surrender, or else. Our weapons are superior."

We have weapons that I believe will deter such an ultimatum or attack. But, an enemy can blackmail us in another way. If they know we are not prepared to keep our own people alive in an atomic attack, they can also say, "You surrender or we can destroy your people with our present weapons." If we do not have better preparation of our own people to do what is necessary to save their lives in an atomic attack, then it will be mighty hard to resist such cruel blackmail. I think we ought to have the civil defense funds in this bill to carry out the policy of Congress voted some years ago.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

(Mr. FORD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, the appropriations bill which contains funds for

the National Aeronautics and Space Administration raises serious questions of public policy and national goals. It calls for cuts of almost \$39 million below the administration request and the authorization act passed by this House. There will be those who contend that this is a relatively small percentage reduction, but such an interpretation is not an adequate analysis of what is happening.

The United States is a late entrant in the major race for the exploration of space in which the Soviet Union has done so well in certain respects. As of now the Soviet Union is ahead in thrust, or propulsion systems. Our country has the talent and the resources to do equally well provided it makes the decision to do so, and applies itself to this end. At stake is our scientific prestige, our technological progress, and our national defense. I know that some people do not like to characterize this competition as a race, but no one familiar with the details of the space programs looks upon them as anything other than very serious. The amount of money being provided should be a pretty fair indication that even those who have trimmed the program view it as a serious affair.

Since the United States has resolved to compete in this area, and I strongly feel we should compete, and everyone agrees we are up against a formidable rival with a head start, it seems to me that the next point of logic would be to do what is necessary to win this competition. I have not been altogether sure that the NASA budget as authorized was completely adequate to that end. I recognize that those responsible did their best to balance our needs in the area of space with all the other competing programs Government wants to finance. It was a well-thought out, carefully programmed plan, conservative in many respects, and certainly finely cut to allow almost no leeway for mischances on the launching pads or the perils of the budget ax.

Some people argue that any agency can squeeze an extra 5 percent of efficiency out of funds which are provided and therefore that a cut of that size or less can be absorbed without harm. I do not believe that in practice this is so in an area or program where time is of the essence. The top personnel of NASA already are bearing down hard to get the most efficient operation that is practical, and have had to trim their budget request well below what many division heads and individual engineers and scientists think they need. Further, the appropriations act and the legislative history of this bill restrict how funds can be reallocated among uses. I do not doubt the care and the sincerity of the appropriations subcommittee in reviewing this bill. But I do wonder whether they are wise to substitute their judgments for those of NASA who carry the responsibility for performance of the work to put us into the lead in the space sciences. I point also to the careful consideration given the authorization bill by the Science and Astronautics Committee. I am not one who has favored the annual requirement of a detailed prior authorization of all funds before an ap-

propriation is made. But inasmuch as we are operating under such laws at the present time, I think we should avail ourselves of the hard work and the judgments made by the authorizing committee. They give time the year around to detailed study of the space program, and recommended approval of the full amount requested by the administration.

As I review the individual items of the budget which have been cut, I am mystified. The cuts on weather and communications satellites are in the area of applications which offer us the hope of an early payoff to our investments. Our work to put man into space is one of the most competitive with the Soviet Union and where we still have a small chance of being first. Nor can I find any justification for unbalancing other programs which were carefully conceived as an integrated whole. The largest personnel cuts recommended in the budget are in the Goddard Space Center which is supposed to analyze the data returned from outer space. Unless we study the results of the experiments, some of them lose much of their value. One of the most serious weaknesses in our space program has been in tracking facilities, and yet this is another area where cuts have been made.

I can only hope that the commendable zeal of my colleagues to keep the budget in balance for the sake of all of us who pay taxes can be tempered by the overriding and compelling circumstances which surround our space program. The cuts are not large in the total budget, but they can cost us months of delay in programs which will spell the difference between leadership in this field and following second best.

In conclusion, I must say the reductions are unwarranted. I am opposed to them. I trust the other body will correct the deficiency and in the final version NASA will receive the necessary funds.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to address a question to the distinguished chairman of the committee. I understand that in this bill there are administrative costs for various agencies of Government, such as the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and so forth. Now, my question is this: Do we recover any of these costs in service fees to various organizations that do business with these agencies?

Mr. THOMAS. The answer is "Yes." In my humble judgment, we ought to recover more.

Mr. PELLY. I agree with the chairman, and I am glad to hear that we do often recover costs.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, as many of my colleagues know, the Veterans' Administration has requested funds to build a new veterans hospital to replace the antique on Wisconsin Avenue which presently serves as a hos-

pital for veterans of this area. I feel that this project is of utmost urgency, not only to fill a need of the Washington area, but also as a necessary part of the health plant of a growing nation.

We pride ourselves on being a healthy country. We like to think that the level of well-being attained by medical science in this country is matched nowhere in the world. We view with great optimism the increase in man's lifespan over half a century from 49 years in 1900 to 70 years today.

But these gains were not spontaneous or automatic. They were made possible by the tireless efforts and cooperation of many groups: research scientists, physicians, nurses, hospital workers, industries, government, and groups of citizens throughout the country. In many cases the advances have been costly. But I think most of us agree that we would not turn back the clock for any amount of saving. We want to continue our exceptional progress toward better health.

The veterans hospital which services the Nation's Capital is 50 years old. Veterans of this area are receiving treatment in facilities of the era of the model T.

This hospital has an authorized capacity of 335 beds. These beds have been obtained at the expense of serious overcrowding and substandard physical facilities. The rather obsolete buildings, which were designed as a girls' school, are not and cannot be made acceptable for hospital purposes. Their use for such purpose make the operational aspect of this hospital most cumbersome as well as expensive from a management standpoint in the utilization of personnel. At this time, due to the age of the buildings, the hospital is definitely a maintenance problem with an ever-increasing operating cost. Moreover, a fire of any proportions could very well result in a major catastrophe, as the doors to rooms occupied by patients are too narrow to permit horizontal evacuation by rolling beds.

Some of the nursing units at this hospital are spread over two and three floor levels and are not readily accessible to an elevator. This factor alone is responsible to a great extent for the high rate of turnover in experienced personnel.

The above facts, together with the increased demand for beds in this area, definitely dictate the need for a modern as well as a larger capacity G.M. & S. hospital in the Washington area to provide care and treatment for the veterans who reside in the District of Columbia and nearby Maryland and Virginia.

The present beds at Mount Alto are insufficient in number to adequately meet the needs of the very large veteran population in the Washington area and to support the diagnostic and special treatment services established at that hospital. Since these beds are usually filled with acute-type patients, it is necessary to continually refer the longer term cases to VA hospitals located in one of the surrounding States. The increase in bed requirements has been generated by intensified demand for a considerably

larger VA hospital in the Washington area. Since there is not sufficient satisfactory construction at any one point of Mount Alto to provide a nucleus from which to begin a remodeling and addition operation the obvious solution to the VA hospital requirements in this area is through new construction on an alternate site.

The efforts to get a modern veterans' hospital for the Washington area has been a long and frustrating one.

Resolution No. 190 of the Federal Board of Hospitalization approved by the President on October 16, 1945, included a 750-bed general medical and surgical hospital. The site was selected on the Nevius tract in Virginia and funds in the amount of \$9,403,800 approved by the Bureau of the Budget on August 12, 1946. The estimate for the 1947 program was \$13,794,000 for this hospital at the same location. There was no estimate for 1948.

The site was changed from the Nevius tract in Virginia to the Old Soldiers' Home, Washington, D.C., during 1948. An item was included for this hospital in the 1949 budget through the 1954 budget. In 1954 the scope of the project was reduced from the 750-bed hospital and facilities for the regional office medical activities located in the VA regional office were included as part of the overall project. The purpose of this was to provide clinical facilities for the hospital and the regional office medical activities so that both the hospital and regional office could be served by common facilities. The estimated cost of this project was \$18,001,000.

An estimate dated June 18, 1953, for a 500-bed hospital on a 750-bed chassis with bomb protection, special air conditioning, and regional office clinical building, totaled \$18,840,000. There was included an item in the 1956 submission to the Bureau of the Budget for a 500-bed hospital on the Soldiers' Home site, which made no provision for a consolidated regional office medical clinic.

On April 26, 1956, the site board report recommended the acquisition of approximately 20 acres on the southeasterly outskirts of the County of Montgomery, Md. It was estimated that the site would cost approximately \$100,000. In May 1957, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs determined that the proposed replacement for the Mount Alto VA hospital would be erected on the Soldiers' Home grounds in Washington rather than in neighboring Montgomery County, Md.

Presidential authorization to add 200 psychiatric beds to the new Washington, D.C., VA hospital was given in a letter dated June 3, 1959. The addition of 200 psychiatric beds required a complete revision to include necessary facilities for these patients. Approval was given with the understanding that the present bed allotment at St. Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D.C., would be reduced by a like number.

Revision in requirements was undertaken in May 1959. The revised requirements were completed and forwarded to the Bureau of the Budget on August 19, 1959.

The project for construction of a VA hospital on the Nevius site in Virginia called for 750 beds. The Presidential directive of December 19, 1952, authorized a reduction to a 500-bed hospital on a 500-bed chassis with provision for outpatient clinic facilities in the hospital. In the 1954 budget, an estimate was submitted for a 500-bed hospital on a 750 chassis at a projected cost of \$16,450,000. A clinical building was included in this plan at a cost of \$2,390,000 for a total of \$18,840,000. As of February 1960 the total project cost for the 700-bed VA hospital to be located on the site of the Soldiers Home, Washington, D.C., was estimated to be approximately \$21 million.

The net result of this bewildering history is that we are just where we started; we still have an old converted girls school, now some 15 years older, as a hospital for our veterans with a bed capacity far below the minimum needs for the area.

The new hospital as proposed will be 700 beds which will include provision for tuberculous, neuropsychiatric, and general medical and surgical patients. The appropriation requested is \$19,760,000.

This new hospital will be designed to serve as a research and testing hospital for many new items of supply and equipment constantly being developed. It will serve also as an administrative research and training hospital with requisite classrooms, recreational halls, and other desirable teaching facilities. There are not presently in any VA hospital suitable facilities for this significant function in the field of progressive hospital administration. The new Washington VA hospital should provide Central Office officials a laboratory wherein they may observe and supervise administrative research and training for the benefit of the VA hospital system as a whole.

The new hospital will be used to provide for the care of acute psychiatric patients. Those veterans with chronic, long-term psychiatric disabilities will be cared for in other VA hospitals within reasonable proximity to the veteran's place of residence. The VA is committed to reduce on a staged basis its allocation of beds at St. Elizabeths Hospital. Furthermore, by reason of modernization, facilities for the care of psychiatric patients at the VA Hospital, Perry Point, Md., will be curtailed to some extent. These facts emphasize the necessity and desirability for proceeding with the construction of the replacement hospital on the site of the Soldiers' Home, Washington, D.C. Activation of the new hospital will permit the VA to eliminate its present bed allocations at the Walter Reed Army Hospital and the Naval Hospital at Bethesda.

Mr. Chairman, lack of action by Congress in the past has prevented building of an adequate veterans' hospital in this area with a consequent cost in suffering to those who already have suffered too much. The appropriation requested is \$19,760,000. We cannot afford to quibble over so small a sum to provide adequate medical facilities for the veterans of the Washington area. The price society pays

for ill health is always many times the amount needed for sound preventive medicine and good medical care.

It is my great hope that funds will be made available for this hospital and that construction will be started without delay. Mount Alto hospital has seen its better days and I am certain that the entire community will welcome the improvement in hospital facilities for District veterans.

Mr. Chairman, in summary, let me say I was very much surprised and, of course, disappointed, to learn that the Committee on Appropriations had deleted a portion of the request made by the Bureau of the Budget in the amount of \$19,760,000 for the construction of a 700-bed Veterans' Administration Hospital here in Washington on the Soldiers' Home grounds. This hospital had been authorized for the past 15 years. There has been a great deal of planning work on that program. Congress appropriated over \$3 million toward the planning. As recently as 1957 it appropriated \$1,100,000 for the drawing of plans and specifications. We should not delay this much-needed project any longer. The existing facility for the veterans of the Washington, D.C., area was formerly constructed as a girls' school back in 1901. It is obsolete and totally inadequate for the proper operation of a veterans' hospital. It is inadequate so far as the type of facilities that we have there and inadequate in the size of facilities. We only have 335 beds out there. We are having to use beds at Walter Reed, at Bethesda Hospital, St. Elizabeths Hospital, and sending veterans hundreds of miles around for treatment.

Mr. Chairman, I propose when the bill is read for amendment to offer an amendment in an effort to have that amount restored. At that time I hope to discuss the problems of this inadequate facility a little more in detail but for the time being I would like to refer to an editorial that appeared in one of our Washington newspapers recently which pretty well summarizes this particular problem. The editorial is headed "Time for a VA Hospital," and it reads:

TIME FOR A VA HOSPITAL

The House Appropriations Committee has turned up the lamest excuse yet for not approving construction funds for a new Veterans' Administration hospital for this area, a project that has had Presidential and congressional approval for years. Facilities are available, the committee said, "in all surrounding directions."

Well, there is a VA tuberculosis hospital 38 miles away in Baltimore, with a long waiting list. There is a facility at Fort Howard, Md., 53 miles distant, with a long waiting list. There is one in Richmond, Va., 107 miles from here, with a long waiting list. In Washington, there is Mount Alto Hospital, built half a century ago as a girls' school and branded for years as outmoded, inadequate, and dangerous. Moreover, Mount Alto, as a diagnostic center, serves patients from other parts of the country.

As far as we know, there is no other metropolitan area of comparable size in the entire country that is so lacking in proper hospital facilities for its veterans. States with political influence are well provided for. Washington, with no political voice, has been scandalously neglected. But political influence—or the lack of it—ought not to be

a factor; need alone should determine where VA facilities are placed, and the need here is evident.

For several years, the proposal for a new VA hospital here foundered on the question of a site; changing defense concepts first dictated a location outside the city, then allowed reinstatement of the original plan to build on the Soldiers' Home grounds. The site is still available, together with planning funds voted in 1957. The House today may have a chance to approve the \$20 million needed for construction. It is time to face up to this long-neglected obligation.

I have here in my hands copies of letters from the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars. I know that other Members have received similar communications in which they express their very strong concern over the fact that these funds were taken out of the bill and urge that the House consider favorably reinstating the funds.

During the hearings, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], stated that we should not appropriate this money now because money is tight, interest is tight, and further expenditures would increase the inflationary spiral.

I do not object to that statement categorically. I think that is an excellent yardstick that should apply to every action taken by this Congress, certainly every action taken in this bill, but I think it should be applied uniformly and not applied to certain projects, because I think that would be discriminatory and unfair.

(Mr. BROYHILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO].

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Chairman, little more than a month ago I was fortunate to participate in the second anniversary celebration of the launching of the Nation's first successful Vanguard experiment. At the dinner, some remarks were made by Dr. Milton P. Rosen regarding the future of space exploration that are pertinent to our discussion today.

When I looked over the report of the Appropriations Committee I was forcibly reminded of these words. Dr. Rosen believes that the launching of man in space will accelerate our interest and our achievements in this great scientific venture that has been entrusted to this country. It seems to me a clear lesson exists for all of us in the emphasis we place on Project Mercury.

I have listened to some people who have doubts about this program. I have seen learned papers which question its significance. Yet I am convinced we are on the threshold of a great achievement, and we cannot falter. I do not rest my case on that most facile of arguments, that we are in a great contest which we must win. I would rather argue it on the merits, that we have found a way to penetrate a great unknown, that we stand to gain much in knowledge and practical understanding if we can accomplish space travel, and that we must, therefore, accord it the highest priority. We cannot just pay lip service to such

a goal. We must be prepared to make whatever financial sacrifices are necessary to do what has to be done to achieve our purpose. My committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana, has made exhaustive studies of the requirements and difficulties of Project Mercury. We know it can be done. We must support it. I would hope that Congress will fully fund this effort. It seems to me that these words of Dr. Rosen explain in great part why so much depends on this:

REMARKS BY DR. MILTON P. ROSEN

I would like to suggest that the future will be considerably different than what we would expect from a normal extrapolation of what we are doing today.

I think the significant factor is going to be something that will happen within the next 1 or 2 years, the placing in orbit and safe return of a man. It seems to me that this will entirely change the complexion of space flight. It think that almost overnight the emphasis will change from instrumented to manned flight, much as Lindbergh's flight across the Atlantic had a tremendous influence upon aviation. Not tens but hundreds of men will be sent into orbit to acclimate them to the conditions of this new and alien environment.

When they have learned to exist there for a few days, or possibly weeks, we will send men to the moon. First one or two and then larger numbers. I foresee a considerable traffic between the earth and the moon consisting of small parties of explorers, some of whom may stay there for a few months, perhaps a year. I would view the activity as resembling to some extent the activities in the Antarctic during the IGY.

Now I think the moon should not be viewed as a future military base, nor as a vacation land. These two prospects I believe are equally fanciful. The polar regions were discovered 50 years ago and have yet to be primarily used for these purposes.

When we have accustomed men to live in space for months and years, we will undoubtedly send men to the nearer planets—Mars and Venus. Now it may well be asked why we should devote the tremendous energy that it will take, the tremendous amount of funds, to this sort of activity. Certainly there are other worthwhile things we could do—medical research, a cure for cancer, better education, more and more schools, perhaps aid to the underdeveloped countries of Africa, Asia, and South America. All of these are worthwhile purposes, and I for one would support any of them.

But the question keeps arising, Why go to Mars when there is so much to be done here on earth? And I think the answer is something like this: It is not enough that we should be healthy, prosperous, and educated; it is not enough unless we use these gifts to serve purposes beyond our personal comfort and prosperity. Aims that expand the scope of man's activity and knowledge—aims that give purpose to life. Man does not live by bread alone.

Those are the words of Dr. Rosen.

Two other points disturb me about the bill before us today. One is the cut in appropriations for salaries and in the number of positions available to NASA. I do not say that the plans of NASA should be endorsed without question. I myself have certain doubts about future plans of the agency. But I believe that in the formative stage we must take special pains to see that the agency is equipped to do its job.

By that, I mean it must be empowered to seek out, attract, hire and hold qualified personnel to direct and supervise its program. Let no one have any doubts about the importance of this space program to the future of our country. We have, in the past, reported on this floor to the Members about the possibilities in communications, navigation, meteorology and other fields. Some of these have since been tested by the satellites which today whirl about the globe. They offer tremendous savings and improvements in our way of life. We must insure that the direction of this program is entrusted to good men. We must insure that NASA has the ability to recruit them.

The second point concerns both NASA and the National Science Foundation. This Nation's future depends in part on the vigor and imagination of its program in research and development. I would stress in particular the basic research we need. Yet in the budget items for both the NASA and the Science Foundation, there is less than wholehearted support to meet these needs.

Testimony before our committee has emphasized that the level of basic research in this country has been falling until we are scraping the bottom of the barrel for ideas. Maj. Gen. August Schomburg of Redstone Arsenal told us:

There has been a frantic using up of our knowledge in the crash development of missiles in the past 10 years. During the same 10 years the competition for funds for missile development has crowded supporting research out of our budgets. So we have virtually exhausted our reservoir of knowledge. We must replenish it or yield our ascendancy—and eventually yield even our equality in the missile race.

These are the questions that disturb me as I ponder the effects of this bill that is before us. Our committee has been entrusted by this House with studying the programs of the Government for science and astronautics, and determining if they are adequate. We know that on the Nation's ability to develop its technology and to make use of it may well depend our future—not only our security, but the jobs and economy of the future. We insist on a progressive and energetic program. We must see that it is given the legislative support it requires.

(Mr. DADDARIO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask a few questions of the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee. Do I understand there is \$4,760,000 in this bill to continue a subsidy to three helicopter operators?

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct. There is about \$4,700,000—that is the figure the gentleman used, I believe.

Mr. GROSS. About \$4,760,000. Is there any justification for this? In

other words, on what basis do we appropriate \$4,760,000?

Mr. THOMAS. That is for New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, and it is purely an experimental matter.

Mr. GROSS. Experimental in what way—just for hauling passengers?

Mr. THOMAS. For hauling passengers and carrying the mail.

Mr. GROSS. Well, we certainly do not need it experimentally insofar as the actual operation of helicopters is concerned. Only yesterday a helicopter landed near the Washington, D.C., ball park and picked up the President after he had attended the ball game and flew him to his jet plane out at Andrews Field, and from there he went back to his golf at Augusta, Ga. So we certainly do not need to spend this kind of money to demonstrate the feasibility of the use of helicopters.

Now I would like to ask the gentleman if the three buildings provided in this bill, at a cost of some \$65 million for the District of Columbia, are authorized by the proper legislative committee.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to my distinguished colleague that our able, genial, and delightful friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. JONES], who is chairman of the Committee on Public Works, handles this. Our offices are across the hall, and the first thing in the morning we discuss these projects, and in the middle of the day we discuss them, and then, late in the afternoon when we both get back to our offices at 5 o'clock we discuss them.

Mr. GROSS. I would appreciate if the gentleman would make the description of his social and business activities as brief as possible since my time is limited.

Mr. THOMAS. Frankly, I do not know. There is no disagreement. The law is such that not the Congress but the legislative committee of the House must concur exactly with the legislative committee of the other body, and I think strictly, to give the gentleman an honest, frank, and complete answer—I think the answer is "No"; they are not authorized.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has \$250,000 in this bill for presidential pensions. That is something that has been dear to my heart for a long time. The gentleman will remember, I opposed the presidential pension bill. I wonder if all the attention that was given to this appropriation is to be found on pages 266 and 267 of the hearings. Were any questions asked on this?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to our distinguished friend that he knows and I know what is involved in this matter. The budget estimate was submitted to us. We have expenses and we have to pay our distinguished and beloved President who will retire in January. There is extra money there for 6 months and we all know what these things are.

Mr. GROSS. Let us ask the gentleman this question. President Eisenhower is going to retire on January 20 of next year. You have \$12,000 in this bill to begin his retirement. Is the President going to draw his retirement pay as a general of Army and with the staff that is provided? Can the gentleman

tell me whether he is going to draw that retirement in addition to what this bill provides? What is going to be the story on that?

Mr. THOMAS. May I humbly state to my friend that that is his private business. I do not know what he is going to do.

Mr. GROSS. This is not altogether his private business. This is the taxpayers' money with which we are dealing.

Mr. THOMAS. But it is his private business to the extent that he can do it or not do it. What he is going to do, I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. Then the gentleman is saying to me that the President can draw \$25,000 a year as a pension from the Government under this legislation dealing with Presidents, and he can also draw, perhaps, the equivalent as a retired general of the Army and he could have two staffs, one a civilian staff and one as is provided for retired officers; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. I am not advised as to the last point the gentleman made.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Fifty Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 46]

Adair	Fenton	Morrow
Addonizio	Fino	Metcalfe
Albert	Fisher	Mitchell
Alexander	Fogarty	Montoya
Allen	Fountain	Moorhead
Andersen,	Frazier	Morris, N. Mex.
Minn.	Frelinghuysen	Morrison
Anderson,	Friedel	Moss
Mont.	Gallagher	Moulder
Andrews	Garmatz	Nix
Anfuso	Gary	Norblad
Ashmore	Gavin	O'Brien, N.Y.
Auchincloss	Gilbert	Osmer
Bailey	Granahan	Patman
Barden	Grant	Perkins
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Philbin
Bass, Tenn.	Griffiths	Pilcher
Becker	Halpern	Powell
Blitch	Hargis	Prokop
Bolton	Harris	Quigley
Bonner	Healey	Rabaut
Boykin	Henderson	Rees, Kans.
Bray	Hess	Rhodes, Pa.
Breeding	Hoeven	Riley
Brewster	Hollifield	Roberts
Brock	Holland	Rodino
Buckley	Holt	Rogers, Mass.
Burdick	Horan	Rogers, Tex.
Burleson	Hull	Rooney
Cahill	Jennings	Roosevelt
Canfield	Johnson, Md.	Rostenkowski
Carnahan	Jones, Mo.	St. George
Casey	Kearns	Santangelo
Celler	Kee	Scott
Chelf	Keith	Shelley
Chiperfield	Kelly	Sheppard
Collier	Keogh	Sikes
Cook	Kilburn	Sisk
Cooley	King, Calif.	Slack
Curtis, Mo.	King, Utah	Smith, Miss.
Daniels	Kitchin	Spence
Davis, Ga.	Kluczynski	Springer
Davis, Tenn.	Lafore	Staggers
Dent	Latta	Taylor
Diggs	Lesinski	Teague, Tex.
Dingell	Libonati	Teller
Dixon	McGinley	Thompson, La.
Dorn, N.Y.	McGovern	Thompson, N.J.
Dorn, S.C.	McSweeney	Toll
Dowdy	Mack	Utt
Dulski	Magnuson	Vinson
Edmondson	Martin	Wallhauser
Fallon	May	Wampler
Farbstein	Meador	Watts

Whitener
Widnall
Williams
Willis

Wilson
Withrow
Wolf
Young

Younger
Zelenko

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. IKARD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 11776, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 260 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] is recognized for 30 seconds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, in the remaining time I have, I simply wanted to point out to the chairman of the subcommittee that under Public Law 85-745 widows of Presidents, who come under this same provision, must waive the right to any other annuity or pension. Under the act of Congress which authorizes this appropriation, nothing is said whatever about former Presidents waiving any other annuity or pension, so apparently they can draw both.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman and yield to him.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my colleague that this is my understanding of the law. In the first place, as far as the Presidents are concerned, they are caught squarely in the dual compensation law, which says, in sum and substance, that they may draw only one pension. But as far as the distinguished President himself is concerned, it is my present understanding that he has resigned from the Army, so there is nothing involved about the Army.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman would not say there would not be a bill in Congress next year to reinstate the President's status as a retired general of the Army?

Mr. THOMAS. I cannot say about that.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman can very well expect there will be a bill to reinstate him in his retirement as general of the Army.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

(Mr. BOW asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, there came to my attention today a matter that I believe should be corrected from an appropriations standpoint. The chamber of commerce of the United States puts out a publication each month, a copy of which I hold in my hand. It is called Taxpayer's Dollar. This is for the month of April 1960. It is No. 4 of volume 9. Because they made a mistake, and I think you all may hear of it, we had better correct it now.

One paragraph in this issue says this:

The District of Columbia appropriation bill is the only bill for the next fiscal year (1961) which has been sent to the President. The General Government, Treasury-Post Office, Interior, Commerce, and Labor-HEW bills have passed the House. Excepting the District of Columbia budget, the total amount requested by the President in these bills is \$10,262 million. The House increased this amount by about \$35 billion.

The House did not increase this amount by \$35 billion, and you are apt to get a lot of mail on this asking what happened to us that we increased this amount \$35 billion. The House has not done this at all. This is a complete error, and I think it must be corrected. When we go back into the House I will get permission to place into the RECORD figures showing that the House has actually reduced the budget by \$280 million, although one or two items were considerably over the budget, and in supplementals we have reduced the budget by \$770 million. The House has done an excellent job on this budget.

When this article by the chamber of commerce says we have increased it by \$35 billion it is just wrong. I think the Members ought to know about it so when we begin to get mail concerning it we can have this complete record that I will include in my remarks. Theirs is by no means complete as to what the House has done.

They make one further statement on the question of the Department of Commerce appropriation bill, which is over in the other body. They say in referring to the Commerce bill:

In the latter, the Senate further reduced the President's request.

They say we reduced it but the Senate further reduced it. We are going to conference on that bill very shortly. I should like to say in regard to that bill that although the House worked its will and made a number of substantial reductions, when the bill got to the other body that body restored practically all the cuts we made and then took a \$40-million bite out of a trust fund account in the highway program. This makes it look as though they reduced it by \$40 million when in fact they have increased it by restoring the budget cuts. Taking the \$40 million out of a trust fund makes it look as though they reduced it, when as a matter of fact they put the money back into the bill, and we are going to have to pay the \$40 million because it is there.

These are the facts I think the Members of the House and the public ought to know, because I am proud of the work we have done and I am proud of the work the House did on that bill.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. I want to thank the gentleman for calling these facts to the attention of the House. He is eminently correct in what he has said. The action of the other body was certainly not what we would call tricky, but it was a devious

way of claiming a reduction under the House figure, something rarely done by the other body.

As to the claim that the House raised the figure by \$35 billion, I think that must be a mistake.

Mr. BOW. That is right. I think it is probably a mistake in proofreading.

I hope we will be charitable and say it is a mistake in proofreading, but they ought to read the proof a little more carefully when they are making a charge of this kind against a responsible parliamentary body such as the House of Representatives.

(The matter referred to is as follows:)

Action on appropriation bills, 86th Cong., 2d sess.

Bill	Estimates	Reported	House passed	House action compared with estimates
1961 bills:				
District of Columbia, 1961.....	\$34,533,000	\$27,533,000	\$27,533,000	-\$7,000,000
Commerce, etc., 1961.....	799,615,000	760,522,235	760,522,235	-39,092,765
Interior, etc., 1961.....	550,330,300	543,375,600	543,375,600	-6,954,700
Treasury-Post Office, 1961.....	4,897,853,000	4,795,414,000	4,795,414,000	-102,439,000
General Government matters, 1961.....	14,302,500	13,787,500	13,787,500	-515,000
Labor-HEW, 1961.....	4,000,083,981	4,184,022,731	4,184,022,731	+183,938,750
State-Justice-Judiciary, 1961.....	713,803,755	676,579,807	676,564,807	-37,238,948
Independent offices, 1961.....	8,416,897,000	8,146,167,400		-270,729,600
Total on 1961 bills.....	19,427,418,536	19,147,402,273	11,001,219,873	-280,031,263
1960 supplementals:				
NASA supplemental.....	23,000,000	23,000,000	23,000,000	
2d supplemental.....	1,008,398,264	229,175,864	237,505,864	-1-770,892,400
Total, 1960 supplementals.....	1,031,398,264	252,175,864	260,505,864	-770,892,400
	Estimates	Law	Reduction	
Final actions:				
District of Columbia, 1961.....	\$34,533,000	\$27,533,000		-\$7,000,000
NASA supplemental, 1960.....	23,079,000	23,079,000		
2d supplemental, 1960.....	1,017,784,888	955,370,003		-62,414,885
Total.....	1,075,396,888	1,005,982,003		-69,414,885

¹ Includes disallowance of \$675,000,000 to partially restore CCC losses, this cut will not result in reduction in expenditures since it is for past losses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK].

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the chairman of the subcommittee whether there is any provision in this bill for an appropriation for trunk airline subsidies.

Mr. THOMAS. No; there is not.

Mr. VANIK. So that it does not include subsidy for any of the major trunklines; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. VANIK. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to commend this committee for its fine work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, it has come to my attention that a trunk carrier has recently applied for a \$13-million annual subsidy to permit it to continue operations. In order to support its case for a subsidy, this particular carrier has flooded the press with a demonstration of its plight. At the very same time it was heading toward deficit operations, its payrolls were overloaded. Among the other usual hazards of air travel, this particular carrier has invented a new one—too many employees on the field at takeoff time.

After loading its payroll in a planned augmentation of its debt, the manage-

ment has arranged for an associate corporation with which it has interwoven financial investments to bring a foreclosure action conveniently coinciding with the subsidy plea now before the CAB. Now we are being besieged with the plight of this carrier in the face of these conditions, and to our attention is directed the fact that this carrier has headquarters in the Washington area employing several thousand employees.

The fact is that the troubles of this trunk carrier are problems of its mismanagement. Subsidies cannot be used with any moral justification as a reward for mismanagement nor are subsidies to be used as insurance for losses resulting from hopelessly inferior operations. There is something basically wrong that the taxpayers' money in subsidies will not cure when a trunk carrier with some of the most lucrative routes in America, operating under substantially the same conditions as all other trunk carriers, falls flat on its face and becomes the first trunk carrier to seek a subsidy since 1951. Those who permitted bad management to destroy the business operation ought to suffer the consequences of their dereliction.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with what my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, has said with respect to this particular carrier. It is a matter on which we have shared the same view for some time, and I commend him for bringing it to the attention of this body at this time.

Three weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, I pointed out that Capital Airlines is the first trunk carrier to request a subsidy since 1951 and was the last trunk carrier to go off subsidy at that time. I mentioned, too, that Capital has the dubious distinction of being the only carrier in the 22-year history of the Federal Aviation Act to receive an order from the Civil Aeronautics Board compelling a company to improve its service. The CAB's order was the result of Capital's record of substandard service to Toledo, Ohio, the district which I represent, of its diminution of flights from eight to two per day and Capital's continued broken promises for improved service.

I urged a careful study of Capital's top management before granting a recent request for a \$12,949,000 subsidy for a 12-month period, and suggested that there is nothing in Capital's record to justify or warrant sending the airline a million dollar check every month at the taxpayers' expense. Recent news headlines have certainly borne out my contention.

Turning to the bill before us, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note the inclusion of \$3,867,700 for a much-needed Federal office building in Toledo, Ohio. As I understand it, this does not represent total cost of the project, but only the amount which it is anticipated will be expended during fiscal 1961. Total cost of the building has been set at \$5.6 million, and date of completion for August 1962. Since funds were appropriated last year for site acquisition and planning, this means that roughly \$1 million will be needed in the fiscal 1962 budget for completion of the work.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] 1 minute.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]. I hope he will be a Member of this body for a long time because he is a valuable member of the Committee on Appropriations and has always brought out measures that are sound legislation.

Frankly, I am disturbed by the decision of our great Appropriations Committee not to grant funds for the Federal share of personnel and administrative costs of State and local civil defense agencies, as provided for in Public Law 85-606.

Public Law 85-606, as you will recall, is the enactment of H.R. 7576, which I sponsored and which I am proud to say is commonly known as the Durham bill. This law bears the unanimous approval of both bodies of Congress. It was the fulfillment of years of study by conscientious, knowledgeable members of the Armed Services Committees of both the House and Senate—men thoroughly versed in the overall defense needs of our Nation. Opinions and information obtained from leaders of government across the country, plus exhaustive stud-

ies made by professional staff experts, resulted in section 2 of the law, stating:

It is the policy and intent of Congress to provide a system of civil defense for the protection of life and property in the United States from attack * * * that the responsibility for civil defense shall be vested jointly in the Federal Government and the several States and their political subdivisions * * * that the Federal Government shall provide necessary assistance as authorized.

Now, legal dictionaries define the word "shall" in this manner:

Where a statute declares a thing shall be done, it is a peremptory mandate.

And section 205 of the act states:

The Director (OCDM) is authorized to make financial contributions to the States for necessary and essential State and local civil defense personnel and administrative expenses.

Certainly no segment of the civil defense program is more necessary or essential than this.

In order to carry out this mandate of the Congress, the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization requested, for fiscal year 1961, the modest sum of \$12 million. The Independent Offices Subcommittee, headed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], was evidently convinced of the necessity of initiating this program and included in its report the sum of \$3 million. The sincerity of Chairman THOMAS was evidenced by his statements to Senate members of the supplemental appropriations conference, wherein he assured them that \$3 million would be in this bill when reported.

I was disappointed, therefore, to learn that the full Appropriations Committee had voted to delete these funds. What can be said against this appropriation? That it will create political jobs? No—all new positions must be filled through a rigid merit system. That it will be a wasteful program? No—on the contrary, it will be considerably less costly than the alternative, outright federalization. Is this just a matter of saving money? If it is—it is unwise economy, in my opinion. I am in complete agreement with the statement of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, the able majority leader of the Senate, who said:

If we speed our defenses and they are not needed, all we lose is the money; if we fail to provide proper defenses and they are needed, we could very well lose our country.

(Mr. DURHAM asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I see on page 18 of the committee's report, and page 6 of the bill, language stating that no part of the appropriations made herein to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for printing the Official Register of the United States. I heartily compliment the committee for this proposal.

In March 1958, when I was chairman of the Subcommittee To Study Federal Printing, I introduced H.R. 11345, to discontinue publication of the Official Reg-

ister. Our subcommittee study regarding this subject disclosed that an annual cost of \$30,000 was being paid, between 1955 and 1957, by the Civil Service Commission to the Government Printing Office for the few copies of the Official Register required by the Commission. The printing costs had been on an increase each year for the past 3 years. In addition to the printing costs which are charged to the Civil Service Commission, more than 2,000 additional copies—which are distributed in accordance with provisions of law—are charged to the congressional appropriation for printing. Added to the printing costs, the Civil Service Commission reports an annual expenditure of more than \$6,000 for preparation of copy and indexing. Further costs are incurred by each department and agency for the compilation of information which they are required to supply to the Civil Service Commission for inclusion in the Official Register. The total overall cost to the Government for compiling, indexing, printing, binding, and distributing the Official Register is conservatively estimated to exceed \$45,000 annually.

In response to an inquiry made to the then Chairman of the Civil Service Commission as to the need for continuation of this publication, he replied to me:

From the standpoint of the Commission's operations, discontinuance of the Official Register would cause no inconvenience or handicap. It is not necessary in any of our work. A canvass of the views of a representative number of agencies revealed no strong reactions one way or another. Some would like to see it continued, others would not be particularly upset if it were discontinued.

I observe on page 718 of the current hearings that Civil Service Chairman Roger W. Jones, in response to a similar question by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], stated that "it is not important, in our judgment."

The Official Register has been published in various forms and at great expense to the Government since 1816. A large percentage of the names listed in the Official Register are now also included in the U.S. Government Organization Manual, which has been printed since 1948. Many of the names are also included in the Congressional Directory. The Official Register is unquestionably an outstanding example of unessential publications which can be discontinued. I think it is a realistic saving, and I am glad the committee put its finger on it. The chairman is to be congratulated for taking this action.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say this has been a fine, clean, wholesome debate. May I say one thing that no one has mentioned in the committee, and I think all have forgotten it. I would like to call the attention of the House to one item, and that is the hearings for the National Science Foundation printed separately under the title

"Comparison of United States and U.S.S.R. Science Education." It is a wonderful document and it is available at the Committee on Appropriations. I hope you will all get it and look at it. It is well worth your time.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Has the gentleman explained to the House the reason for the rather heavy cut for the National Science Foundation? It is practically a 17-percent cut.

Mr. THOMAS. We gave them about what their budget was last year, plus about \$7 million.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. BOLAND. I think the gentleman has asked a good question, and I think the record will show that the committee has done a very good job. I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana that this is one of the agencies of the Federal Government of which we are most proud. It started 10 years ago. It started with an appropriation of \$3,725,000. In the bill which this committee brings to the floor today we report \$160 million. All of this increase has been generated by the interest that has been shown in scientific exhibits throughout the United States, and this is the agency that is responsible for doing that. The request they made was for \$190 million. We gave them the same as they used last year. We gave them more than they have had at any time during their 10 years of their existence. I think this is a reasonable figure.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. This is about the amount they had last year.

Mr. THOMAS. It is five or seven million dollars more than they had last year.

Mr. BOLAND. Most of it goes for awards and to educational institutions. We think they have done a good job in that area. We are proud of what this Foundation is doing. They are developing a program that is one of the finest of all. All of the Members who are familiar with the studies they are making are proud of their work. We think we have come a long way in the last couple of years. We think it ought to be able to get along well with \$160 million.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Your time is about consumed, but when we go under the 5-minute rule I am going to ask for time to say something with reference to this matter.

Mr. BOLAND. I appreciate the gentleman's concern.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION
FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

For expenses necessary to enable other Federal agencies to perform such civil defense and defense mobilization functions as

may be designated by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, including payments by the Department of Labor to State employment security agencies for the full cost of administration of defense manpower mobilization activities, \$6,250,000.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, following my questions to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. Thomas] with reference to the cut for the National Science Foundation, I recognize that this is a good, conscientious, capable committee. On the other hand, the thing that disturbs me, the cut that this agency has sustained in this bill is greater than the cut received by any other agency. It is far more than the average cut given other agencies of Government. It leaves about the amount which this agency received last year.

This is the agency that does the basic research, and I was very much heartened to hear from members of the committee such a fine statement regarding the work of this agency, because I think the National Science Foundation is doing a splendid job. You do not hear of waste or throwing around of money, nor scandals of any sort connected with this agency of the Government.

I have analyzed the cuts quite extensively.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD. These are my own remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman may extend his remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I wish to register the vigorous objection to the action taken by the Appropriations Committee in cutting so severely the 1961 budget of the National Science Foundation.

If I have ever seen a classic illustration of being "pennywise and pound foolish" this is it.

Mr. Chairman, the reductions made by the committee for the entire independent offices appropriation amount to a total average cut of some 3 percent. Yet the National Science Foundation has been cut 16.5 percent. More than 5 times the average cut.

Why?

Why is the Foundation, which represents the major sustained interest of the U.S. Government in basic research, singled out for this sort of discriminatory treatment? I have searched the committee report, but I can find no real clue there.

Let me take a moment to put this thing into a proper perspective for Members of the House.

The National Science Foundation is charged with stimulating and improving basic research in the United States. Basic, not applied. This means research

in totally new areas, concepts, and designs—the end result of which cannot usually be foreseen. It is not a matter of mere development, engineering, or technique. In this latter department, which we call applied research, we in the United States are doing very well.

In fact, it is doubtful if any nation has ever displayed our ingenuity for making useful applications of known scientific facts. But in this era of science in which we find ourselves today, we are scraping the bottom of the barrel of known scientific facts. We must uncover new ones, make new breakthroughs, pioneer deep into unknown fields in order to stay up in the scientific community. We are never going to compete with Russia in the next decade—or any other competent scientific nation—just by continuing to make engineering refinements based on old knowledge.

Mr. Chairman, every noted scientist who has testified before the Congress in the past 3 years—and there have been hundreds—has been in agreement on this point. We must make new basic discoveries.

Yet here we are, leading off into the decade of the sixties—stepping off into a true age of science where knowledge promises to be the most critical commodity a nation can possess—and what are we doing? We are crippling our Nation's basic research effort—an effort already miserably inadequate. We are now preparing to stunt its growth even more.

Returning to my basic thesis, let me suggest to you that by cutting the Foundation's budget by nearly 17 percent, by denying the Foundation this \$31 million, we are unlikely in the long run to save a nickel. On the contrary, we can be pretty sure that one day in the not-too-distant future we will wind up behind the scientific eightball because one of the modest programs planned here was killed. Then we shall have to undertake a crash program and spend many times the amount contemplated in fiscal 1961 in order to learn the basic scientific facts we should have been acquiring all along.

Mr. Chairman, I have here a summary of the Foundation's program which will be curtailed or eliminated by the proposed cut—including research on the satellite telescope which competent astroscintists believe would be worth a dozen of the 200-inch Mount Palomar telescopes. I should like to include this summary in my remarks at this point.

REVIEW OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
APPROPRIATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1961

The overall reduction for all independent offices appropriation was about 3 percent. The Committee on Appropriations has recommended a reduction of \$31,600,000, or 16.5 percent of the fiscal year 1961 budget estimate of \$191,600,000 for the National Science Foundation. The nature of the committee's

recommendation is such as to make reductions necessary in three primary areas: Support of Basic Research, Sup-

port of Basic Research Facilities, and Science Information Service as shown in the following table:

	Fiscal year 1961 budget estimate	Fiscal year 1961 distri- bution of committee recommended total	Reduction	Percentage reduction
Basic research.....	\$78,800,000	\$70,283,000	—\$8,517,000	10.8
Basic research facilities.....	29,550,000	10,850,000	—18,700,000	63.3
Development of graduate research laboratories.....	(15,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(—13,000,000)	(86.6)
Science information.....	8,935,000	5,335,000	—3,600,000	40.3
Foreign currency.....	(1,600,000)	(0)	(—1,600,000)	(100.0)
Scientific manpower.....	67,300,000	67,053,000	—247,000	0.4
Program development and management.....	7,015,000	6,479,000	536,000	7.6
Total.....	191,600,000	160,000,000	—31,600,000	16.5

The committee report on the independent offices appropriations for fiscal year 1961 states that the National Science Foundation has as its basic objective the support of basic scientific research and the development of trained scientific manpower.

The committee apparently did not consider it necessary to further the attainment of these objectives beyond the general level supported in fiscal year 1960. This action, if sustained by the Congress, will be extremely detrimental to the continued growth of a strong, broadly based national scientific effort which must be undergirded by vigorous expanding basic research programs at colleges and universities adequately supported by modern research facilities. The national potential for basic scientific research has increased several fold in recent years, as shown by the research proposals received by the National Science Foundation which have increased from a total of less than \$25 million in fiscal year 1955 to an estimated \$190 million in fiscal year 1961. These are generally high quality research proposals which are received from over 300 different institutions of higher learning and involve the work of about 3,000 principal investigators. Even with the funds for basic research grants requested in the President's budget, the foundation would be able to support only about 38 percent of this work. The nature of the Committee on Appropriations' action is such as to make necessary a minimum reduction of \$8.5 million for basic research which will result in support for only about 33 percent of proposals. It is not in the national interest to fail to utilize the capabilities of so large a proportion of our college and university scientists to perform basic research in their own fields of science.

In addition, basic research is a vital ingredient of science education programs, particularly at the graduate level and the denial of such a large proportion of research proposals will adversely affect the efforts of many colleges and universities to develop and improve their science departments. Basic research is an important factor in the retention of science faculty members and in the training and development of advanced students. Actually a cut of \$8.5 million in the basic research program would eliminate the means of support for ap-

proximately 1,000 advanced graduate students who would participate in the research.

The Committee on Appropriations in its report appears to have made a distinction between the Foundation's objective of supporting basic research and the proposed program to share with colleges and universities in the extremely costly effort of modernizing graduate research laboratories and on this basis, apparently intended to reduce \$13 million from the \$15 million requested for the development of graduate research laboratories. Due to obsolescence and other factors, adequate modern research laboratory facilities are not now available in a majority of colleges and universities. As a means of assisting the institutions to improve their research facilities, the Foundation initiated a \$2 million pilot program in fiscal year 1960 with the Federal Government sharing equally with the institutions in the cost of laboratory improvements. The need for this program is shown in part by the response of the colleges and universities who have submitted, through March 1960, proposals for Foundation support totaling over \$20,500,000 which would require the investment of an equal amount of their own funds. The size of this response was limited by the experimental nature of the program. The Committee on Appropriations recommended reduction in the National Science Foundation's budget estimate would make necessary a drastic curtailment in the major benefits which would accrue to the national effort in the field of basic research and science education if universities and colleges were encouraged and assisted in improving their own research laboratory facilities.

The Federal Government, through the National Science Foundation, has financed the construction of two major facilities for research in radio and optical astronomy at a total cost approximating \$20 million. The Committee on Appropriations recommended total appropriation would provide only sufficient funds for fiscal year 1961 to continue the interim or preoperational level of support allowed in fiscal year 1960. To continue this interim level in fiscal year 1961, when major instruments will either start operation or be in an operational test phase, will seriously cripple programs requiring nearly a full operating

staff and will also require the elimination of all new programs such as the advanced optical or space telescope program. This space telescope program promises to provide one of the major forward steps in astronomy ever undertaken. The program to improve basic telescope research equipment at each observatory would have to be eliminated although experience has shown that rapid technological changes, particularly in electronics, requires a continuous program of improvement to assure the technical adequacy of research performed with the instruments.

Less than full utilization of these costly research facilities would be detrimental to the country's scientific effort in astronomy as well as poor economy considering the major initial investment.

The effect of distributing the total reduction recommended by the Committee on Appropriations would be a reduction of 40 percent below the budget estimate for programs in the critical area of science information. Planned programs to increase the availability of Soviet and other foreign science information will be severely curtailed, particularly the new program which utilizes excess foreign currency accruing from the sale of surplus agricultural commodities. Assistance to valuable U.S. scientific and technical publications which cannot be fully self-sustaining on a subscription basis will be severely curtailed. This is an area for which the Foundation has been assigned special responsibility by the Congress and the President. Planned programs to improve the methods and techniques of disseminating scientific information will also be curtailed. In this latter program area, development of modern searching and retrieval techniques using electronic data processing systems is an urgent necessity if the results of scientific research are to be effectively available to investigators.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me remind you again that this National Science Foundation apportions these research projects. As projects develop, it may be some are terminated while others are continued from year to year. This agency, of course, has expanded; the field of science is expanding, it is expanding terrifically. The work in space is not the only thing which has expanded, but it is all science, whether it be medical science, agricultural science, engineering, all types of basic science are going forward, and all of this is going to require more money in the future, whether we like it or not. I want to call that to the attention of this committee and I hope all of us will keep open minds in reference to the National Science Foundation Act when it comes up, if it does, where it is seriously hurt in reference to serious cuts, that you will give it an audience and a hearing. Our committee has gone over the work of this agency very carefully. We are impressed. I join with what the distinguished gentleman had to say about the fine work. We are impressed with the fine work of this agency and I for one want to see it continued.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF
CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, \$60,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: Page 5, line 1, strike out the figure "\$60,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$55,240,000", insert a colon and add the following language: "Provided, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for helicopter operations."

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will accept this amendment, which simply cuts out \$4,760,000 for the purpose of subsidizing the operation of helicopter service in three cities. I know of no reason why the Congress of the United States should continue to subsidize the operation of commercial helicopter service.

I find nothing in the hearings to justify this appropriation. The statement submitted by those who are asking for the appropriation talks in terms of the necessity for continuing this as an experiment in connection with the carrying of passengers. Millions of dollars have been spent for the same purpose in recent years. Now, in my opinion, is an awfully good time to save a little money and stop this unnecessary subsidization.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. Chairman, there is merit to the argument made by the gentleman from Iowa that there seems to be discriminatory treatment in favor of three cities when service of this type and subsidies apply to only three. It is discriminatory but pilot operations always are. I concede there has been a long test period, but that is drawing to a close. This service is nearing the end of its subsidization. The decision will have to be made within the near future, within the next year or two, whether it is a feasible service to be carried on between airports and central points in the metropolitan communities of the country.

Justification for subsidization of its service was offered to the committee by the companies. The argument of the Chicago company appears in the hearings. It is claimed that as a result of this operation the Department of Defense was furnished much valuable information. The Army used the experience of the companies and specifically sought information from them.

The cooperation between them has been very good indeed. Moreover, the Post Office Department considers this service essential for its purposes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any more reason why we should subsidize a helicopter service than a taxicab service?

Mr. YATES. I would think there is as much reason to subsidize a helicopter service as the service of feeder airlines between small cities. This experiment may well determine the future of helicopter service in metropolitan communities and between adjacent communities. Perhaps this will be the mode of express travel within cities in the future. I do not like subsidies any more than the gentleman does. We are told the value, economically and otherwise, will be determined within the next 2 years. Is it not intended to be a perpetual subsidy, although it has proceeded for many years already. I think the companies recognize that Government assistance will be terminated shortly.

The testimony that has been given to the committee is to the effect that the helicopters now being used are of the small type. It is expected that large helicopters, carrying many more people, will be introduced in service within 2 years. The new helicopters are expected to bring in enough revenue to eliminate the need for subsidization.

For that reason I suggest that the companies should be permitted to continue their operation for 2 years to see whether or not their prediction of the future will come true.

Mr. GROSS. Has not the President pretty well established that helicopters are practical?

Mr. YATES. The President is apparently satisfied with helicopter service, because he uses it so frequently. Cost is no factor in the use of his helicopter. This service, it is hoped, will show that other people in the country can use helicopters, too, at reasonable prices.

The reason for the three services is to permit the people of three metropolitan communities to test a service which may prove to be an exceptionally valuable one in the future. I think we ought to permit it to continue for the next 2 years which the companies say they will need. At that time, the subsidies should definitely end.

Mr. GROSS. This is purely a matter of sufficient passengers to sustain the operation; is it not?

Mr. YATES. That is correct. But they do not have sufficiently large helicopters now to carry the number of passengers it would take to provide the revenue to enable the operation to be profitable.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, then in order to test this out on that basis, if your formula is right, we should put airport helicopter service in St. Louis, Miami, and every city in the United States.

Mr. YATES. I would say to the gentleman that this may well happen in the future, not as a subsidized operation, but as an operation which can sustain itself. I refer the gentleman to the statistics that I placed in the RECORD showing the growth of popularity in passenger

travel in helicopter service. I suggest that the trend is favorable.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would just like to ask the gentleman who was speaking in favor of this amendment, will there be an opportunity, after there has been a demonstration about the practicability of this device or service to get rid of it? So that you may understand what I am trying to ask permit me to digress. We all know that the railroads have been flirting in certain ways with the trucklines, making agreements for the hauling of freight. Presumably they are also having some negotiations with the planes as to the carrying of passengers as well as freight. Now, this service which you speak about we all realize may be necessary at the moment and while the experiment is being carried on, but how are you going to end it when it reverts to private enterprise? Suppose we want to quit. Having in mind this decision rendered by the Supreme Court on Monday last where the railroads attempted to close certain passenger stations. The result would be that some of the people operating the telegraph would be out of a job. A court enjoined a strike called in protest. The Supreme Court reversed the decision which held that the railroads could not close those stations and the no longer necessary jobs because the Norris-LaGuardia act so provided. Now, if we establish this helicopter service and the Supreme Court sticks to that kind of a decision, how are you going to get rid of it if the employees do not wish to be deprived of their jobs?

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I suggest to the gentleman that that question is a Civil Aeronautics Board question. If it certifies this operation, why, then they will be able to proceed. Insofar as subsidization of this operation is concerned, the way to get rid of it is by striking it from the appropriation bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Suppose there is a labor dispute between the operators of a helicopter and the company or whoever is operating the service, there is a labor dispute, and the Supreme Court says, "You cannot end the service." That is what they said Monday in no uncertain terms. There you are. And, this particular railroad is bankrupt. What are you going to do? Continue the appropriation to subsidize the railroad so that these telegraphers can have jobs?

Mr. YATES. The gentleman ought to take that up with the Supreme Court.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They do not listen to me. But, if recent decisions are to prevail, if unneeded employees cannot be discharged, if demands for higher wages are not met, if a strike can tie up a business and a court refuses to permit the employer to go out of business or move, will the court tell him where to get the money to continue in operation?

As soon as the decision to which I made reference is printed, which I assume will be tomorrow, I will put it in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I hope our friend from Iowa will withdraw this amendment. I ask that because I am inclined to agree with him. This thing has been going on for 8 years. A good many Members on both sides of the aisle have spoken about this particular matter. Certainly I hope the gentleman will let it go one more year, and if they can make up their minds in one more year, we can all get together and make up their minds for them.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GROSS. Since most legislation is a compromise, and with the gentleman's assurance that he will do his best to stop the appropriation next year, if that is the understanding—

Mr. THOMAS. I did not say I would do my best to stop it. I said I would do my best to look at it, because I am agreeing with my very good friend that perhaps 8 years is a long enough time to experiment.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot see this idea of going on for another 2, 3, or 4 years.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I said 2 years.

Mr. GROSS. Two years.

Mr. YATES. I said 2 years to mark the end of the subsidization, which is what the gentleman wants and I want. But, I think the 2-year period from now, giving them a chance to bring a superior helicopter into operation, will provide an adequate test.

Mr. GROSS. I cannot see another \$10 million for this kind of a subsidy.

Mr. YATES. I agree with the gentleman. I do not think it will be \$10 million.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will my friend from Iowa withdraw his amendment, and then we will see if we cannot get rid of this next year.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, accepting the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], and with that understanding, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Expenses

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development and for establishment of air navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act; purchase of 20 passenger motor vehicles for replacement only: not to exceed \$5,000 for representation allowances and for official entertainment; and purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; \$365,245,000: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GROSS: On page 9, lines 1 and 2, strike out the language which reads as follows: "not to exceed \$5,000 for representation allowances and for official entertainment."

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is a relatively small amount of money, but this entertainment business is catching on in every agency, bureau and department of Government and it ought to be stopped.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman does not mean catching on; the gentleman means pouring in.

Mr. GROSS. I accept the gentleman's amendment. It certainly is pouring in.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. As I read the bill, the gentleman's amendment would strike the words "for representation allowances and for official entertainment" which would then make the bill read, "not to exceed \$5,000 and purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes."

The gentleman did not mean his amendment to have that result.

Mr. GROSS. My amendment would strike out the language "not to exceed \$5,000 for representation allowances and for official entertainment." The bill will still provide for snowshoes and skis.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I just wanted to make sure that I had the \$5,000 to do it with.

Mr. GROSS. I do not know whether the skis and snowshoes are to go to Squaw Valley, Calif., or where they are to go.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am happy to yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. How does the gentleman distinguish between entertainment and snowshoes and skis?

Mr. GROSS. I do not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What do you use them for—for entertainment?

Mr. GROSS. This might be to patrol some communication line; I do not know.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You know some folks you would like to put on skis, do you not?

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that as I recall the testimony of General Quesada—he was the general who flew General Eisenhower over the Normandy Beaches and is now head of the Federal Aviation Agency—his principal function is to control the air space of the Nation and also international airways. He testified to our committee that there are some 68 international airlines that come into the United States or into parts of the United States and there have to be international conferences to adjust the air space control. He wants money to represent the United States at these meetings. What he uses it for I do not know but he very strongly stresses the fact that he needs this fund at these conferences.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I have just returned from the Second Conference on the Freedom of the Seas, held in Geneva. Our Ambassador had a very limited amount of money for entertainment. This was embarrassing to him. Other countries, whether it should be or should not be, do a good deal of entertaining. It is at such places that a lot of the small talk takes place at these conferences.

I am sure he could not have carried on and would not have had the success he did if some of the interests, fishing interests in particular, who were there and very much concerned, had not picked up the tab on his entertainment. I am sure in these modern days we should have money available for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. It seems it has become very necessary for the American taxpayers to provide entertainment and liquor all over the world for everybody. We passed a bill the other day to provide \$1 million for the State Department and related agencies for that purpose. I did not vote for it but some of the rest of you did.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. This is the first time this item has been in this bill. This is a new agency, and it has been in operation only 3 years. They have 50 or 60 people of their own scattered in 10 different countries. Maybe they will have more than 60 people in these countries. This is a small matter, and if it will help matters any I suggest we adopt the gentleman's amendment and take it to conference, unless the gentleman wants to withdraw it.

Mr. GROSS. No; I will not withdraw it.

Mr. THOMAS. We went into it thoroughly in the committee, and they said they needed it.

Mr. GROSS. This is becoming so fashionable all through the Government that somehow, some day, you are going to have to put a stop to it.

Mr. THOMAS. We are not going to give it to them just because they want it.

Mr. GROSS. You have another \$10,000 in this bill for entertainment. I intend to try to get that out, too.

Mr. THOMAS. If an agency comes in and shows without any doubt about it that they are doing business legitimately and have people over there, we will give them the money.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to construct public buildings projects and alter public buildings by extension or conversion where the estimated cost for a project is in excess of \$200,000 pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), including equipment for such buildings, \$144,836,000, to remain available until expended; *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be available for public buildings projects at locations and at maximum construction improvement costs (excluding funds for sites and expenses) as follows:

Post office and Federal office building, Camden, Arkansas, \$633,250;
Courthouse and Federal office building, San Francisco, California, \$37,286,100;
Courthouse and Federal office building, Hartford, Connecticut, \$7,636,400;
Federal office building, Miami, Florida, \$7,076,250;

Post office and courthouse, Thomasville, Georgia, \$1,094,000;
Border station, Jackman, Maine, \$289,850;
Border station, Van Buren, Maine, \$284,750;

Border station, Vanceboro, Maine, \$254,150;

Immigration and Naturalization Service center, (construction and alteration) Detroit, Michigan, \$874,650;

Border station, Sweetgrass, Montana, \$586,500;

General Services Administration stores depot annex, Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$469,200;

Post office and courthouse, Bismarck, North Dakota, \$3,224,050;

Federal office building, Toledo, Ohio, \$3,867,700;

Post office and courthouse (construction and alteration), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$5,601,500;

Courthouse and Federal office building, Memphis, Tennessee, \$9,587,150;

Border station, El Paso, Texas, \$1,055,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Dayton, Washington, \$282,200;

Federal Office Building Numbered Nine, District of Columbia, \$20,031,100;

Federal Office Building Numbered Ten, District of Columbia, \$38,326,500; and

United States Court of Claims and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals building, \$6,375,000: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limits of costs may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected in other projects, but by not to exceed 5 per centum.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language

beginning with line 9 on page 16 of the bill and running through line 14 to and including the "\$6,375,000" that it is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, there is no question about it. The point of order is good.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY (PAYMENT TO REVOLVING FUND)

For payment to the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, \$5,000,000.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PUCINSKI: On page 24, line 22, after the comma, strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000."

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, referring to the discussion we had earlier in the day on this appropriation, I should like to commend the committee and its chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] for the good judgment they have shown in this entire matter in reducing the entire budget request by some \$270 million. While I am in full agreement with the committee's effort to keep the cost down, I could not, in good conscience, fail to raise a protest and make an effort to restore this particular appropriation for direct loans, long term, low interest rate loans to private non-profit institutions that want to build housing for our aged citizens. You recall, this House originally authorized an allocation of \$100 million for this purpose. The conference committee reduced that figure to \$50 million. Today, the committee comes before us with the recommendation that we expend only \$5 million for a pilot program. I do not think \$5 million is really going to constitute even a pilot program. If the House were to adopt my amendment and allocate the full \$50 million for this purpose, we could only build 5,000 units in America for housing the aged in low rental housing. There are in this country some 16 million people today drawing social security. There are an additional 4 million people today drawing old age assistance. Three out of every five of those drawing social security today receive less than \$20 a week. I said earlier on the floor, that I have a letter on my desk from an elderly couple who are receiving a total of \$130 a month in social security benefits. Their rent right now is \$75 a month and they have have been served notice that the rent is going up to \$80 a month shortly. How in God's name can this couple survive on the remaining \$50? This bill is not a hand-out. This is for direct loans, long term, low interest rate loans to be given to reputable, respectable, not-for-profit organizations to build housing at low rent for our senior citizens. It would also provide loans to private not-for-profit organizations which now operate homes for

the aged to renovate or expand their existing facility to provide low-cost housing for more senior citizens.

How in the world can we appropriate millions and billions of dollars with impunity for everything else that confronts our country and completely ignore the problem of the senior citizens, which is one of the greatest problems in America today. I do hope the House will support this amendment. Fifty million dollars will build only 5,000 units. This is a drop in the bucket compared to the need. This \$50 million—originally \$100 million was suggested—was supported by the American Municipal League, by the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and the National Housing Conference and the American Hospital Association.

This is a serious problem in America. When I was a youngster and you were young fellows, you had a house where you could always find an extra room for grandpa or grandma. But since the war we have built these small homes where there is hardly room for the immediate family. They cannot take care of the older parents, because they have no room. The program I propose is a program that is just as American as America itself. This is no handout. We are not asking for relief. All these people are asking for is long-term, low-interest loans, so that they can set up low-interest housing. They can get financing under the FHA at 5¾ percent, but a non-profit organization financing its housing under these high interest rates has to charge more for rental than the average old couple can afford to pay. By the time you get through paying 5¾ percent on a mortgage you cannot possibly bring the rent down to the level that recipients of pensions can pay. This legislation would bring rent on the average home built for old people down at least \$20 a month. This may well mean the difference between this old couple surviving and not surviving. I strongly urge this House, with all due respect to the committee—I think the committee has done a magnificent job on this bill in cutting out many things—but in this instance I hope the House will support this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] has expired.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph close in 7 minutes, with 2 minutes reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It has been my good fortune for most of the past 6 or 7 years to be intimately associated with the construction of a number of homes for the elderly in my own area. I have had occasion to talk to many of the builders. I have been able to talk to many people who were occupying buildings that were built by our churches.

May I call to the attention of the House that admission to many homes financed conventionally costs from \$10,000 to \$15,000. I would say that the

rental payment for many of the homes financed by the conventional plan run upwards from \$125 to \$150 per month, which severely limits the income levels that can be served by such housing for the elderly.

Even the FHA projects with which I am acquainted, have rental schedules that are close to the margin or beyond it, for many pensioners in my own State where we guarantee \$105 a month.

What the gentleman is proposing is not a program of grant or gifts. He is proposing loans. This is identical to the college dormitory program. What is proposed here is that the Government make available loans from the Federal Treasury which will be fully repaid with interest.

I call attention to the fact that in Colorado the Legislature has appropriate money to build housing for rent within the income of the aged.

The alternative to this program is not a conventionally financed program, because that will not answer the purpose. The alternative, I submit, will be a series of State and local homes not managed by nonprofit organizations interested in the well-being of the people they serve, but by the Government, and the cost will be higher, not lower.

I strongly support the amendment. I hope the House will vote for the amendment offered by our colleague from Illinois. I now yield to him.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I agree with the gentleman from Colorado in what he has said and appreciate his support for my position.

As the gentleman from Colorado said, the only alternative is public housing and those other forms where the Government does not get its return.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, this bill deals with a revolving fund. Once we set this money to work, it will be paid back and used again to build other homes. It is my hope that the original appropriation will build not 5,000 homes but 50,000.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion. The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

(Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this motion is made at this time to make the record clear as to why the amendment is opposed. It is not because care or homes for the older citizens are not approved but the proposed method is not only inadequate but wasteful and cannot succeed—it would but make a bad situation worse. Increase the appropriation to \$500 million. We still would not even begin to solve the problem. The gentleman speaks eloquently and with a sympathy we all share. There is not a Member of this House who disagrees with the desire of the gentleman from Illinois to take

care of the unfortunate aged. But it is an impossibility to do that the way we are trying to do it. I know a little something about this; I am getting along in years myself, and so is the good wife. We build or provide a home, then we find we have to maintain it and that entails not a little effort and expense.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I cannot. You expressed the thought very well, but we should not waste any more money in an effort to do the impossible.

You cannot take care of the older people by just building them a home; somebody must bring many of them groceries. Somebody must get some of them up in the morning. Somebody must help put some of them to bed at night. There are many necessary things which must be done each day for most of them. There are many practical questions that enter into the picture. Questions which must be answered almost each hour of the day and which cannot be properly answered by just furnishing a home. That is but a very very small part of the problem.

You remember the money we spent on WPA, PWA, CCC and I do not know how many other places. Of course, in the old days everyone was against the poorhouse; remember the poem "Over the Hill to the Poorhouse." No one wanted to go to the poor house—that was a disgrace as it was to accept charity—certainly I did not. When I came here I found hundreds and thousands of people living in apartment buildings, houses in one sense, but just rooms in another sense, living in what some considered coops or pens—certainly not homes with yard and garden. I did not think much of it until I realized that those people were living in the Nation's Capital, that they had hot and cold running water, that they had electricity for light, heat and other uses. They did not have to go out and cut wood or carry coal, dig out ashes, and they did not have to go down in the back yard to find a pump. There were a dozen or more burdensome chores that did not come each day. They were very comfortable and most of them as happy and contented as it is possible for an aging individual to be. They were growing old but gracefully and appreciatively.

Why cannot some committee or some organization find some way to build group housing where each couple would have two or perhaps three rooms, where they could live in comfort, let them cook their meals and consider taking care of the place as a home as long as they could? And as the individual or couple failed—as they all would—be given such assistance and kindly care as needed.

We must devise some way to take care of those who cannot care for themselves, but certainly this is not the way, and the occupants can be given better care than if we attempted the impossibility of trying to keep individuals or couples in a separate building with the attention necessary to watch for their needs. I understand that in recent years some of them arrived in Chicago, for instance, with all their possessions wrapped in a sheet or pillowcase. We cannot kill

them off. We cannot throw them into the river. We must take care of them, and we must find some way to take care of the aged people, no matter where they come from or live.

We spend billions to help strangers. Why not build up to date properly equipped apartment houses with sufficient attendants and services and do the job with kindness and affection. I speak on this matter here in this way so that a vote against the amendment could not be construed as a refusal to do a manifest duty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I certainly want to commend our distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois, and the gentleman from Colorado, but I respectfully suggest that in the interest of helping the old folks this amendment should be voted down.

Let us recount what has happened. There was an authorization of \$50 million for this program which was passed some time last year. There was no budget estimate for even one penny. In order to give the administration some basis for establishing the program we wrote into the bill an appropriation of \$5 million.

We discussed this quite adequately with the housing people. We asked them to set up four or five pilot projects throughout the country so that they could gain some experience. Then we went to the legislative committee of the House and we cleared it with the chairman of the legislative committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS], who said:

We will be glad to accept this \$5 million.

On that basis we put it in here. Let us not upset the applecart. I think the President will accept this. So let us vote the amendment down and get four or five pilot projects started and see what it is going to do. The experts tell us that this program will cost \$15 or \$20 per month cheaper than the FHA program, and, Mr. Chairman, the public housing program, we are told, would even be \$15 or \$20 cheaper than this.

Let us take a look at it. We ought to help these old folks, but in our desire to help them let us not set the program back 2 or 3 years.

I respectfully suggest that the amendment be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PUCINSKI) there were—ayes 4, noes 72.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other

such appropriation, but the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation shall not be thereby increased.

Not to exceed \$10,000 of appropriations in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations and any emergency or extraordinary expense pursuant to section 1(f) of the legislative authorization for appropriations for the fiscal year 1961.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. The language on page 27, beginning with line 14 through line 19, I contend is legislation providing for an appropriation not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard?

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, we will have to admit the point of order is good, the entire legislation has not been cleared by both bodies or signed by the President, so if the gentleman wants to make a point of order against any section of it, to be perfectly frank about it, it is good.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas concedes the point of order and the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
Salaries and expenses

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; \$160,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount not less than \$30,250,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,600,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used to purchase foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104(k) of that Act.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask the chairman of the committee if during the hearings, on the justification for these educational grants, he found any evidence of any grants being made for the purpose of studying the relationship between husband and wife and the norms and consonances as perceived within those relationships.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to my distinguished friend, the language is rather broad. But, these grants are made for the study of medicine and so forth. To be perfectly frank about it, there are about 2,100 different categories, and if you read some of the titles of them, it is rather confusing, I must confess.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman will recall that only a few days ago we discovered that the Department of Health,

Education, and Welfare was making grants or had made a grant of \$33,000 for that purpose, for studying the relationships.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not think they are doing anything like that.

(Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, what is our national space program? Is it the bold and competitive program that many Members of Congress would like to see? Is it the measured program proposed by the administration, which has been described as "creeping into space"? Or it is a still more modest program, which Congress is willing to support by appropriations?

The authorization act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration calls for exactly the amount of money requested by the President. Under the independent offices appropriation bill—H.R. 11776—this amount would be cut by almost \$40 million.

What will the country think if Members of Congress, who have been criticizing our space program for its slow progress and lack of urgency, refuses to give the Space Agency even the modest amount that the President says it needs?

How can this Government do its business properly if its accepted programs are nullified or undermined by budgetary decisions? Without the necessary funds, a policy is a mere aspiration. It is the budget and appropriations made by Congress that translate our policies into programs.

When Dr. Glennan recently appeared on the "Meet the Press" television program, he was asked whether the cuts in the space budget made by Congress last year had slowed down the space program. His reply was that budget cuts always force a reduction of certain projects and particularly long-range projects. He said that last year's cut had delayed the development of the F-1 engine at least 6 months. He added that others thought it had set back the program by 12 to 18 months.

There is no reason to doubt Dr. Glennan's further statement that NASA budgets are tight. In the space business, as you know, failures are apt to occur. Space budgets must allow for unexpected costs resulting from failures—for example, the provision of backup vehicles. It is too much to expect that they can also allow for cuts by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, the independent offices appropriation bill—H.R. 11776—would reduce the budget request of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by \$38,985,000. The amount allowed for salaries and expenses would be cut by \$4,260,000 and the requested increase in staff by 373 positions.

The NASA budget estimates for fiscal year 1961 have passed the careful scrutiny of the Committee on Science and Astronautics. Most of the proposed increase in salaries and expenses over last year's budget was due to the transfer of the Huntsville facility, now called the Marshall Center, from the Army to

NASA. The Congress has already approved this transfer. It should be understood that this transfer will not raise Government costs as a whole, since the resulting increase will appear not only as an addition to the NASA budget but as a deduction from the Army budget.

Apart from the Marshall Center, the bill would eliminate 373, or almost 40 percent, of the 962 new positions requested. The only reason given for this action in the report that accompanies the bill is that the NASA headquarters office already is overstaffed. But only 75 of the requested new positions would be at NASA headquarters. No reason is given for eliminating almost 300 more.

There are now 533 authorized positions at NASA headquarters. This hardly seems too many for an agency that will soon employ 16,000 people and is conducting a highly complicated, urgent program in many different places throughout the country and the world. Furthermore, the concentration of NASA personnel in Washington is low compared with other independent agencies. For NASA, the concentration is only about 5 percent. This compared with nearly 9 percent for the Federal Aviation Agency and more than 25 percent for the Atomic Energy Commission. In some independent agencies, the headquarters concentration runs almost as high as 50 percent—or 10 times what it is for NASA.

In addition to the 75 new headquarters positions included in the NASA budget estimates, 75 new positions are requested at the Wallops Island Station, and 786 at the Goddard Space Flight Center. To complete the list, there would also be 26 new positions at various offices in the field.

Is there any serious doubt of the need for the new positions requested at Wallops and Goddard? In response to our expanding space activities, the Wallops Island Station is being converted into a major test center. During the next fiscal year, it will be called upon to launch, track, telemeter, and recover a substantially greater number of satellites and space probes. The Goddard Center is an entirely new laboratory for research in the space sciences. Its establishment was authorized by the Congress 2 years ago by Public Law 85-657. During the next fiscal year, it will begin to carry out its assigned programs of earth satellites, sounding rockets, and manned space flight.

The bill allows in full the funds requested for rocket and vehicle development. But development presupposes people. After careful study, the Committee on Science and Astronautics concluded that the new positions requested by NASA were both reasonable and necessary for the programs that had been approved.

Of the approximately \$39 million cut, the largest reduction was made in the funds for research and development, which everyone concedes comprises the heart of the space program.

It is regrettable that the Appropriations Committee saw fit to reduce these important funds, although I commend it for approving the full \$277,608,000 au-

thorized by the Congress for rocket and rocket vehicle development, including the important Saturn program.

An analysis of the research and development reductions reveals that they shape up as follows:

Aeronautical and space research, \$10,135,000.

Scientific investigations in space, \$2,100,000, including \$400,000 in the program for sounding rockets and \$1,700,000 in the scientific satellites program.

Satellite applications, \$1,400,000 in the vital programs for the development of meteorological and communications satellites.

Manned space flight, \$2,750,000 in the Project Mercury program.

Vehicle systems technology, \$1,200,000 in the programs connected with space exploration.

Tracking and data acquisition, \$1,628,000 for the operation of facilities necessary to support the overall space flight program.

These programs are all equally important and it would serve no useful purpose to single out any of them for emphasis, but I would like to point out that a cut in funds does not necessarily represent a saving in the ultimate cost of these programs.

For example, the sounding rocket program, which was cut \$400,000, is designed to extend and to fill in gaps in the knowledge so far acquired on the earth's upper atmosphere. Now, this data can be obtained in good part by the use of scientific satellites, but it is much cheaper to acquire this information, where we can, by sounding rockets. There is a tremendous difference in the cost of sounding rockets and satellites.

Again, the meteorological and communications satellite programs, which were cut \$1,400,000, will some day, in the not-distant future, bring incalculable benefits to all humanity, including economic benefits to this country and its people.

The best way to save on some programs is full steam ahead.

Of course I know that it is generally said that no agency is ever satisfied to see its budget estimates reduced, and while there have been reductions in the construction and equipment portions of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration budget estimates, I can find no serious damage to the agency's program where there has been a minor reduction in each construction request, particularly where these items are based on a square-foot construction cost. Nor do I take serious issue with the Appropriations Committee's action in disallowing fallout shelter construction in some of the buildings. However, the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to disallow the construction of four buildings and facilities, and this I do seriously question.

One of the most serious deletions made by the Appropriations Committee in dealing with the construction and equipment portion of the NASA authorization bill is the request for \$4,400,000 for funds for construction of a central laboratory and office facility at the Mar-

shall Center. This deletion creates a very serious problem, not only for the space agency but likewise for the Department of the Army, for the funds requested are necessary to relieve the congested administrative office situation that presently exists in the joint use of buildings by personnel both of NASA and of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency. Under the terms of the Army-NASA transfer plan dated December 11, 1959, it was agreed that Buildings 4488 and 4484 would be retained by the Department of the Army and NASA was to provide for the new construction, but until such time as this was provided, NASA and the Army would jointly occupy the two buildings that formerly housed the Development Operations Division of ABMA and the Aeroballistic Laboratory and the Research Projects Laboratory.

Transfer of the Development Operations Division from ABMA has of necessity increased personnel requirements of both the Van Braun team and the Army Ballistic Missile Agency, and as this occurs there is greater congestion and a bad situation becomes worse. NASA assumed the responsibility under the transfer plan of providing adequate housing to relieve the then already congested situation, and certainly in all good conscience and good faith this item must be restored, for in effect this construction carries out the terms of the transfer plan of the Von Braun team which the Congress has already approved.

I have been informed that the Department of the Army strongly supports the request by NASA for this central laboratory and office facility. The inhouse effort which the Army had devoted to the space programs, and which has been transferred to NASA, is less than one-fourth of the total Army's inhouse program at Redstone Arsenal although about 50 percent of the usable working space has been transferred. This has forced the Army to refurbish and utilize undesirable, inferior and temporary type of structures for many of its remaining administrative and laboratory needs. Obviously, therefore, the expanding NASA programs cannot be accommodated by commandeering further facilities from the Army. In this respect it is cogent to note that the fiscal year 1960 program at the Army Ordnance Missile Command, exclusive of space efforts, is equal dollarwise to the fiscal year 1959 program including space.

The expanding national space program, Saturn, Nova, and Centaur, coupled with the added emphasis on military missile programs such as Pershing and others, makes it abundantly clear that we cannot continue to try to squeeze a size 11 foot into a size 9 shoe.

The Appropriations Committee states in its report that it has allowed the requests for all of the essential facilities at the Marshall Center, including the Saturn static test facility, extension to assembly building, and so forth, and yet it is denying \$1,948,000 for completion of the Guidance and Control Building, and likewise denying \$215,000 for an addition to the Fabrication Laboratory. I

would not question the sincerity of the gentlemen of the Appropriations Committee in their determination of what is not essential, but I am suggesting that were these buildings in the Marshall Center not essential for the effective furtherance of our national space program, they would not have been placed in the budget in the first place and in the second place they would have been removed either by your Committee on Science and Astronautics or by the Bureau of the Budget.

The justification for the completion of the Guidance and Control Building may be summed up with the simple statement that this is necessary to convert a building that was formerly devoted primarily to military weapons to research and development oriented to payloads, satellites and space vehicles, thereby assuring successful completion of the programs assigned to the Marshall Center.

The justification for the addition to the Fabrication Laboratory is simply that it is required to adequately house the activities presently being conducted therein. For example, a portion of the entrance lobby has been enclosed and is now occupied as an engineering office. Also some units are housed in buildings located at considerable distance, resulting in inefficient liaison and coordination activities. The Saturn program has been greatly implemented by funding, and as the chain is only as strong as its weakest link, then the work of the Saturn development can proceed only as quickly as the Saturn facilities are likewise implemented. Further progress in the Saturn program makes this addition even more acutely needed.

The Appropriations Committee is also denying \$435,300 requested for construction of a publications library and technical services building at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory. Oddly enough, it did not deny a request for \$60,000 for the purchase of 3.4 acres of property lying contiguous to the southwest boundary of the Laboratory upon which it is proposed to construct this building.

The programs generally at the Jet Propulsion Laboratory have greatly changed over the past few years, so that the Laboratory now has a greatly expanded mission. Its personnel growth has been rapid and suitable buildings have not been constructed to keep pace with the increase in personnel.

This particular building would contain not only the general administrative offices of the Laboratory but would also house the main library, the reproduction department and a central documents control room and editorial office for the technical reports group. There are not sufficient facilities at the Laboratory to allow a regrouping of these administrative groups to enable them to function efficiently, and I do indeed urge that this item be restored.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I may say that I do not know of any element in this bill that could be removed with safety if

we are going to go forward with the projects that NASA has set out for itself, which are so important to close the gap between this country and the Soviets. I am not familiar with where this \$15 million is coming from.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I can tell the gentleman where part of it is coming from. When the Army gave up the Von Braun team and turned it over to NASA they had to arrange to provide for quarters and accommodations in buildings to be built down at Huntsville. A part of that is affected here. The work of NASA is not going to be adequately handled unless they have those facilities.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. As I read the report of the committee, this is a reduction of the President's budget.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. By \$39 million.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The administration recognized the need for additional funds in order to meet the challenge we are facing from the Soviet Union in running the civilian space program. Although Saturn and Mercury are pretty well taken care of in the budget, this will have its effect upon the research and development and the building construction program that needs to be carried on. So the responsibility is not with the administration but with the committee.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I will say this to the gentleman. I earnestly believe that we are making a mistake. We ought to give them the money that is requested and needed. Our committee spent several weeks, more than a month, on this bill. I think it is a serious mistake not to give them the money.

Mr. EVINS. If the gentleman will yield, I am sure the chairman of the committee is very serious in this advocacy of this, but there are 19,000 employees in the NASA program, and it is only a year and a half old. They have \$160 million. That is not going to stop the program.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. The employees are largely transfer employees.

Mr. EVINS. They have 19,000 employees and there are 8 installations all over the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I move that all debate on this paragraph on page 26 close in 7 minutes, including the time requested by the gentleman from Louisiana, with 3 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Actually, NASA simply succeeds NACA. NASA took over the employees of NACA, who had been on the Federal payroll for many years. In addition, this year it took over the Von Braun team that consisted of approximately 5,000 employees in one group, because of the transfer. Normally the funds for the Von Braun team would

have shown up in the Defense Department appropriation, but because they are transferred in a bloc this year to NASA, naturally the funds show up there. It is not quite fair to say that this agency, only 2 years old, has expanded from zero to 19,000 employees. On the contrary, it has consolidated with other agencies that have served long, hard, and faithfully and without criticism the U.S. Government, and it is to a large extent retaining those employees. There are relatively few new employees under the NASA program. I think the record ought to reflect that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER].

(Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I say to my good friend, the gentleman from California, and my good friend, the gentleman from Louisiana, that no one has the monopoly on this subject. We are as much in favor of this program as anybody. We are trying our best to go ahead with it. We are told that this is the 16th largest business in the United States, and I guess it is. It looks as if it is going to get much bigger. Here is \$915 million. Talk about slowing it down? Nothing could be further from the truth. The big problem with this agency is to use well the money that it has.

They inherited 9,000 employees in California, Ohio, and Virginia from the old NACA. Then they took over one more laboratory in California with 2,500 employees. There is the new center being built nearby, and nobody is hurting Von Braun in Alabama. He is the brains, and if we ever lose him, Lord help the program. Let us be frank about it.

Referring to the big satellite projects, the booster is what we need. What we need is that thrust. You have \$382 million for the Saturn and Mercury programs. Do you know how much was cut out of it? Not one penny was cut out of it. We specifically employed the agency not to cut it. We will pinpoint the little measly \$39 million. It is guesswork out here in the Pacific where you are going to try to pick up that falling object, and you have here allocated \$35 million for that. Nobody could tell within 20 percent what it is going to cost to pick it up after it has fallen. My time has expired and all I can say is that we will help this program and we are just trying to put a little sense into it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RENEGOTIATION BOARD
Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including hire of passenger

motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals, \$2,870,000.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

If I may have the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee, as I understand the position of my friend, just so that we can have the Record clear. The Committee on Appropriations has one problem and the legislative committee has another problem. But, as I understand my friend and the subcommittee, there is always a supplemental budget and if they say that NASA shows there is additional need for money, just as you did last year, where you put through a \$23 million supplemental budget, this year you will make a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. THOMAS. This is based on an overrun, and if the estimates prove to be inaccurate, we are going to give them whatever they need. You know it and we all know it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. In other words, the subcommittee also put through a deficiency item. I remember I went to the chairman of the subcommittee and he took that item and put it through especially. It was held up in the other body due to the civil rights bill there, and, as I remember, you took it out specifically and put it through as a separate and individual resolution.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. On a big program like this, you rightfully put in the authority for the transfer of 5 percent of the money between appropriations for research and development and construction. At no given time can they come up with a firm program—and they should not because they ought to have the right to change their minds. They do change their minds. Last year they cut out the Vega \$41 million program after \$17 million had already been spent. Now that was all right and nobody objects to that. They may substitute one that will cost \$66 million.

Whatever they need they are going to get. There is no disposition on the part of anybody to cut them off. We are just asking them to be prudent as they move along.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. YATES. There is the 5 percent interchange in this bill. If the agency wants to they can take 5 percent from one fund and allocate it to another fund.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. There is no disposition to hurt the program. We want to accelerate it and go forward. There is no cut in funds for the investigating work. It is only for one fancy building which they can get along without. There is no disposition to interfere with the program.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I have always thought this subcommittee was very fair. As the gentleman has already said, he is going to keep an open mind, and if they need money and they can make a proper showing, they can get it, and he will back them up.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. I would like to say that I join with the chairman of my committee. We have found the chairman of this committee very sympathetic.

Mr. McCORMACK. I want the record to show that in a deficiency a short time ago there was an item for NASA and I personally went to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and asked them to take that item out and put it through separately, and the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee and the members of the subcommittee and the full committee cooperated. And the chairman of the subcommittee has assured us that the same consideration will be extended in connection with any deficiency appropriation that may be necessary during the next fiscal year where there is a case made out.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. SAYLOR. As a result of this assurance by the subcommittee, does the gentleman think we will hear anything more about this missile gap?

Mr. YATES. Let me point out that the President himself says there is a distinction between that missile and scientific experiments.

Mr. EVINS. Dr. von Braun testified we are behind in the trust and power field. The building will not hurt it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION
Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$8,525,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to revise and extend my remarks, and I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may appear in the RECORD following the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

[Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]
NEW GENERAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL HOSPITAL
IN CLEVELAND

(Mrs. BOLTON (at the request of Mr. SCHWENGL) was given permission to ex-

tend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, northern Ohio will be deeply grateful to the committee for including in this bill—H.R. 11776, the independent offices appropriation bill for fiscal year 1961—funds for the construction of a new general medical and surgical hospital in Cleveland. This new hospital was authorized in 1948 to replace the present Crile VA Hospital which was built by the Army in 1942 as a temporary structure and acquired by the VA in 1946. The present Crile Hospital physical plant is woefully inadequate for the care of the more than 715,000 veterans who reside in the 38 northern Ohio counties over which the Cleveland VA regional office has jurisdiction. It is to be located on a tract of land which is in close proximity to Western Reserve University's School of Medicine. This will greatly assist in the medical care of our veterans as many faculty members also serve as specialists on the staff of the VA hospital. As the committee has pointed out, the established policy of the Veterans' Administration in locating new hospitals as close as possible to medical centers has been invaluable in providing inpatient care to veterans.

The architectural planning for the construction is already underway, and with the funds provided this year the VA should be in a position to award a construction contract by next January or early spring.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, \$39,100,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SAYLOR: On page 34, line 23, after the word "Code", strike out "\$39,100,000" and insert "\$75,000,000."

(Mr. SAYLOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield if it is not taken out of my time.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that it be not taken out of the gentleman's time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, it is getting quite late. We would like to finish this bill tonight. If there is any record vote it will, of course, go over until tomorrow. Could we not agree to time for debate on the Veterans' Administration items?

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Veterans' Administration section of the bill close

in 15 minutes, the last 3 to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Veterans' Administration section close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SAYLOR. I object.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate dealing with the Veterans' Administration section close in 25 minutes, the last 5 to be reserved to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, at the insistence of the Appropriations Committee for an overall plan for hospitalization of veterans, the Veterans' Administration several years ago presented to the Congress with the President's approval a plan whereby the number of hospital beds in the United States for veterans should be fixed. As a part of that program and in an effort to make sure that the Appropriations Committee would know what the present and future needs of this country would be for the proper care of our veterans population, the Veterans' Administration came up with a 12-year program which would call for the rehabilitation and modernization of 125,000 beds of its hospital system which were authorized for veterans in an orderly and planned basis.

Over a 12-year period it called for the expenditure of \$900 million in equal annual installments. The Veterans' Administration this year asked for the first year's appropriation of \$75,000,000 so that there could be an orderly development and rehabilitation of the hospitals.

The Appropriations Committee in the bill before you cut the request from \$75 million to \$39,100,000.

The effect of this cut will mean that the approved program of 12 years cannot be carried out as scheduled. It will not only defer the two hospitals which have been completely deleted, but it will also of necessity push back a number of other sorely needed projects which would be accomplished according to the schedule which the Veterans' Administration has presented.

The requested appropriation provides for construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and becomes available for use after Presidential approval of individual projects or groups of projects. The facilities may include new and replacement hospitals, acquisition of sites, modernization of existing plants, and fixed and initial portable equipment.

The Veterans' Administration recognized the need for a comprehensive appraisal of requirements to modernize the VA hospitals and domiciliaries con-

structed prior to World War II. In October 1958 the Administrator appointed a task force to study and appraise jointly with the Bureau of the Budget, the hospital and domiciliary replacement and modernization requirements through fiscal year 1971.

The task force concluded its study in June 1959 and recommended—with concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget—a program of replacement and modernization of our hospital system estimated to cost approximately \$900 million, including the unfunded portion of post-World War II new hospital program.

The Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget have agreed that this cost should be apportioned over a period of 12 years or at the rate of approximately \$75 million annually. This appropriation request is the first increment of funds for the plan and is the estimated additional amount needed in 1961 for the following projects and programs:

New hospitals—construction	
initial portable equipment and technical services:	
Cleveland, Ohio, 800 beds----	\$21,250,000
Washington, D.C., 700 beds----	19,760,000
	41,010,000
Replacement hospital—construction and initial portable equipment, Martinez, Calif., 500 beds-----	11,714,000
Modernization, improvement and repair:	
1960 major (construction and initial portable equipment)-----	14,470,300
1961 major (technical services)-----	3,787,000
1961 minor (construction, initial portable equipment and technical services)-----	4,856,200
	23,113,500
Total required-----	75,837,500
Less savings from prior year programs-----	837,500
Net appropriation request-----	75,000,000

The Veterans' Administration hospital system is the largest single system in the world. Its 125,000 beds in 172 hospitals are distributed throughout the United States. The capital investment in this system is estimated to be in excess of \$2.5 billion. Maintenance of these facilities is essential to continued care of the veteran population as prescribed by the Congress. From a long-range viewpoint, the facilities and medical organization are a tremendous social asset to our country.

Maintenance of the physical plant is a complex problem. In addition to normal deterioration of structures due to age, there is the increasing rate of functional obsolescence brought about by the rapid advancement in medical techniques and technology in recent years. The changing diagnostic category and

geographic location of patients also has impact on the physical plant.

There is a wide range in the ages of structures. It varies from over 70 years to current new construction. At the close of World War II, a major bed expansion program was established to care for the anticipated increase in the number of service-connected veterans returning from that war. This program, which provided 37,740 beds, is now substantially complete. During the period 1946-60, VA obligated in excess of \$1 billion on postwar construction, most of which was for new hospitals, replacement hospitals, and modernization of existing hospitals.

Only limited resources were applied to maintenance and improvement of the older pre-World War II hospitals in the system. Some of these hospitals have reached a stage where, aside from functional obsolescence, physical deterioration will require replacement and/or major modernization.

It is recognized that aside from the additional new construction, VA has not since World War II kept abreast of the physical and functional obsolescence that is accruing in our hospital system. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, in his appearance before the Veterans' Affairs Committee in July and August 1958, pointed up this problem and raised the question of "Where do we go from here?"

As an answer to that question the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs presented his 12-year program and this is what it includes:

What the \$900 million program includes:

	Cost in millions
A. Modernization of pre-World War II hospitals-----	\$589.1
1. Modernization of 72 hospitals—65,629 beds-----	503.7
a. Application of per bed cost formula—35,297 beds, including improved bed spacing but not modernization for 7,422 neuropsychiatric beds-----	263.4

	Cost in millions
b. Individual hospital estimate—additional funding required for 22 hospitals where modernization is partially completed or in progress involving 20,765 beds-----	\$96.2
c. Individual hospital estimate—special modernization problem involved at 9 hospitals, 9,567 beds), including the modernization and partial replacement of 2 surplus military hospitals, Augusta and Richmond—1,525 beds-----	127.1
d. Initial portable equipment-----	17.0
2. Cost of air conditioning beyond minimum requirements-----	85.4
1. Replacement of 3 pre-World War II hospitals subject to modernization-----	76.0
b. Remainder of pre-World War II hospitals-----	9.4
B. Hospital replacement program----	189.3
1. Replacement of 3 pre-World War II hospitals (1,939 beds) and a 350-bed new addition to the Bay Pines, Fla., hospital-----	72.4
2. Replacement of 12 surplus military hospitals—8,090 beds-----	195.7
	268.1
Deduct funded portion of replacement program, including the 1960 budget-----	78.8
C. Completion of post-World War II program-----	75.9
1. Unfunded cost of Cleveland, Ohio, 800-bed general hospital-----	21.3
2. Correction of deficiencies in existing hospital-----	13.0
3. Air conditioning-----	41.6
D. Unfunded balance of fiscal year 1960 \$33 million construction program-----	28.7
E. Consolidation of six regional office outpatient clinics-----	5.9
Total estimated cost-----	888.9

In addition to modernization the program includes a replacement program as follows:

Location	Authorized bed capacity	Estimated cost (in millions)	Remarks
Bay Pines, Fla. (addition)-----	350	\$7.0	Authorized; construction not funded.
Coral Gables, Fla.-----	800	22.5	Do.
Downey, Ill.-----	800	23.3	Under construction.
Fort Thomas, Ky.-----	350	6.3	Not yet authorized.
Jackson, Miss.-----	500	14.2	Authorized; funds appropriated.
Long Beach, Calif.-----	1,600	23.1	Construction of 1st phase completed.
Martinsburg, W. Va.-----	765	20.0	Not yet authorized.
Memphis, Tenn.-----	1,000	25.0	Authorized; not funded.
Nashville, Tenn.-----	500	13.8	Authorized; final plans stage; funds appropriated.
Oakland, Calif.-----	500	12.1	Authorized; construction not funded.
Sau Juan, P. R.-----	200	6.0	Not yet authorized.
Temple, Tex.-----	500	15.0	Authorized; not funded.
Vancouver, Wash.-----	575	14.4	Not yet authorized.
Washington, D. C.-----	500	24.5	Authorized; construction not funded.
Wood, Wis.-----	1,250	35.5	Authorized; not funded.
Total-----	10,379	268.1	
Deduct amount funded, including 1960 budget.		78.8	
Estimated unfunded cost of program.		189.3	

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FOLEY].

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment and I shall direct my remarks to the committee's action in deleting the new 700-bed hospital in the Washington, D.C., area. The site of this hospital is at the Old Soldiers' Home which is located within the confines of the District of Columbia. I wish to stress to the Members of the Committee that support for this amendment is bipartisan, it is not political. The need for this hospital has been demonstrated through recent years by the findings of various subcommittees. In fact, at one time the hospital was to be located in my congressional district. However, upon further study it was discovered that the space and area in the Soldiers' Home locale adjacent to the Washington Medical Center was a more suitable site.

The committee report states that this is a too extravagant facility. I submit that is not an argument which can stand on its own feet under any circumstances in face of the pressing need we have in Washington, D.C., for the hospital.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LANKFORD].

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am particularly interested in replacing the Mount Alto Hospital which is woefully overcrowded, it is woefully outdated, and is not a fit place for our veterans.

The committee has said, and I quote from an editorial that was referred to earlier in the day by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL], that facilities are available, as the committee said, "in all surrounding directions." The facilities are not available in all surrounding directions. All the members of the committee have to do is to sit in my office for a short period of time and get call after call after call from veterans who need hospitalization and are unable to get it, and to listen in while I call a hospital and get the same answer time after time after time: "We do not have any beds available."

Mr. Chairman, there is a shortage of hospital beds in this area. I do not care what the committee says, there is a shortage; additional beds must be furnished. This has been recognized for years. The replacement for Mt. Alto is needed. The money for planning was appropriated back as far as 1957. Further delay cannot be accepted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of the Saylor amendment and address myself to the portion of the amendment which restores the funds which were cut from the Budget Bureau's request for the construction of a 700-bed hospital in the District of Columbia.

I should like to again refer to a statement made during recent hearings by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, concerned with this item, that this project can be delayed for 5 or 10 years due to the fact that money was tight and interest was tight and further expenditures would increase the inflationary spiral. I agree with the gentleman from Texas that this is an excellent yardstick to apply to every item in this bill and, in fact, to every action taken by this Congress. Furthermore, I have no quarrel when the application of this yardstick might reduce appropriations for my own congressional district. However, I feel that this yardstick should be applied equally and uniformly to all items, rather than singling out one or two items and then attempting to fit the items to the yardstick. This is most unfair and discriminatory. Moreover, when we have all decided and agreed that a program is desirable and necessary, we should carry out the program in an orderly fashion.

Insofar as delaying this project is concerned, I should like to call to the attention of the House the fact that this project has already been delayed for 15 years. Three million dollars has already been appropriated for planning. In fact, \$1,100,000 was appropriated for plans and specifications as recently as 1957. I see no justification for postponing and/or delaying any longer.

The existing facilities located at Mount Alto are totally inadequate. It only has a 335-bed capacity and was never designed for use as a hospital to begin with. In fact, it was originally constructed as a girls' school back in 1901. The buildings are old and dilapidated and the maintenance is extremely costly. Due to the improper layout there is a great deal of administrative difficulty in operating this facility. Many of the rooms and wards have to be used as hallways and the difficulty in properly utilizing personnel causes an extremely costly turnover. In fact, in many instances nurses have to serve on two or three floor levels at the same time with no accessible elevators.

Probably the most serious defect is the fact that it is a fire hazard, and in the event of a fire the results would be catastrophic. For one thing, the doors are too narrow to remove bedridden patients in the event of emergency. These obsolete facilities are a disgrace to this Nation which owes so much to its veterans. This Washington facility is by far the most outmoded one in the country.

Mr. Thomas has stated that he has been at Mount Alto and that the facilities there are adequate. I believe that Mr. Thomas is the only individual who has this opinion. If I had the time I could

show you all the pictures I have here proving the obsolescence and inadequacy of these facilities. However, since time does not permit, I have them here for anyone who cares to review them to have the opportunity to do so.

Now in regard to the need for a 700-bed facility in Washington, I should like to point out that a 750-bed facility was authorized as far back as 1945. That was 15 years ago, and everyone knows that this area has an explosive population. Our population has increased since 1945 to approximately 2 million today, and all estimates of the experts indicate that the area will have 3½ million by 1970.

If we compared the ratio of hospital beds per veteran in the Washington area with the country as a whole, we would find it compares most unfavorably. It compares unfavorably even with the number of persons per bed in civilian hospitals throughout the country. For example, the national average of civilians per hospital bed is 108 nationwide, the national average for veterans per Veterans' Administration hospital bed is 190. In the Washington area, the average veterans per hospital bed numbers 392. Can there be any doubt about the need for more veteran hospital beds in the Washington area?

It has been pointed out that the Washington veterans can use other Veterans' Administration hospitals at a distance from Washington. I should like to state here that these hospitals, which are located in Richmond, Roanoke, and West Virginia, are likewise overcrowded and have long waiting lists. Furthermore, no veteran in any other metropolitan center of this great Nation of ours has to travel so far in order to receive adequate treatment in a veterans hospital.

At the present time, due to inadequate facilities at Mount Alto Hospital, we have the Veterans' Administration here using 10 beds at Walter Reed Army Hospital, 40 beds at Bethesda Naval Hospital, and 350 beds at St. Elizabeths Hospital. All but 150 beds at St. Elizabeths could be turned back if this new hospital was constructed. In addition, the outpatient clinic now located in the Munitions Building can be moved to this new hospital. By consolidating all these far-flung operations, we can certainly expect better staffing and more efficiency in performing veterans medical care in this area. I repeat that the existing obsolete facility at Mount Alto is seriously and dangerously overcrowded, and at the present time only the most acute emergency cases can be treated. I should also like to point out here that many calls from Members of Congress in behalf of their constituents must be turned down regardless of the emergency nature due to inadequate facilities.

I realize that a challenge has been made to the effect that the proposed cost of this hospital is exorbitant. I do not believe, however, that the many other things planned for inclusion in this facility have been taken into consideration in determining whether or not the cost is proper. One thing that is

planned to be included is a research and testing hospital for new items of supply and equipment for use in veterans hospitals throughout the country. Another item is an administration research and training hospital, including classrooms, and so forth, which would be of benefit to all of the 170 other Veterans' Administration hospitals throughout the Nation in providing them VA-trained personnel.

I am reliably informed by responsible officials of the Veterans' Administration that if we consider the actual cost per bed for this hospital facility alone, the cost per bed would be less than that provided for in the Hill-Burton Act.

A very important factor that we must consider is that this is the first leg of a \$900 million 12-year program of repair and remodeling, as well as improvement of our Veterans' Administration hospital program. A \$75 million request was made this year but was cut to \$39,100,000. What are we going to do? Scuttle this program? Postpone it? Delay it? Or, in a piecemeal fashion, alter the entire program by hit and miss cuts in the appropriations?

I should like to submit that this hospital has the full support of the administration and, as I have stated before, was included in the budgetary request this year. It also has a very strong and enthusiastic endorsement of all our national veterans organizations. Many of the Members have already received telegrams and letters to this effect, I am sure.

Some people feel that our Nation's Capital should have one of the best Veterans' Administration hospital facilities in the country. I do not believe, however, that anyone thinks that it should have the worst in the country. I hope the membership will support the amendment to restore these funds.

(Mr. BROYHILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me be yielded to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. This amendment would simply restore the budgeted sum for hospitals under the VA program. It would restore the sum for the hospital that was slated in the budget to be constructed in northern California and restore the sum for the hospital to be built here in Washington. This is the amount requested by President Eisenhower; approved by the Bureau of the Budget, and approved by the Veterans' Administration.

There are many in the House today who have received wires from the DAV. Some have received letters from the VFW. Some have received wires from

the American Legion. All of them are in complete agreement on the restoration of these sums. I might say as far as the California hospital is concerned that this is a bipartisan matter. I have here in my hand a telegram from the Governor of California, Governor Pat Brown, who is of the Democratic Party. The wire, which is addressed to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], reads as follows:

There have for several years past been pending before Congress bills to appropriate funds for the construction of a new veterans hospital in northern California. I have in the past recommended this appropriation, and I take this means of again recommending it to you.

The veterans groups in California are unanimous in the belief that such a hospital should be constructed. The present facilities are now, and have been for some time, inadequate. I hope you will give favorable recommendation to this appropriation.

This also has the support of the labor groups. I have in my hand a letter from the president of the California State Building and Construction Trades Council, also addressed to the chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee, the Honorable ALBERT THOMAS. That letter reads as follows:

DEAR MR. THOMAS: It is my understanding that the budget for fiscal year 1961 recommends that the sum of \$11,714,000 be appropriated for a Veterans' Administration Hospital to replace the present Oakland VA Hospital.

On behalf of the California State Building and Construction Trades Council, I should like to urge that this appropriation be approved by your subcommittee. There is an urgent need for this new hospital in northern California.

Sincerely yours,

BRYAN DEEVERS.

I also have a letter from the AFL-CIO which I would like to read at this same point, because it brings out the fact that this has labor support. This is dated April 14, 1960, from George D. Riley, legislative representative, and is addressed to me. It reads as follows:

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BALDWIN: In your discussion of the necessity for a Veterans' Administration hospital facility in the Bay area, it will be appreciated if you will make known to the House membership at large the feeling of urgency in regard to this proposed project.

It is fully realized that the influx of population in the immediate and general vicinity is of such need that the Veterans' Administration itself acquired a suitable site several years ago. It further is my understanding that the architectural contract has even been let and that what now is indicated is the appropriation with which to proceed.

Many of the veterans concerned in the situation are members of organized labor. It is their welfare and the welfare of all veterans in general which is at stake here.

We trust that the House will see the importance of this matter which I have heard you and representatives of labor from your district and region in general discuss before both House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees.

Sincerely,

GEORGE D. RILEY.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER].

[Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. More particularly I should like to address myself to the money that is being sought to be restored to replace the Oakland hospital. Oakland is a long way from Kansas, but I would particularly like to have the attention of the gentleman from California who just preceded me, Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER.

I was a member of the Hospital Subcommittee of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs back in 1955. I served under the chairmanship of the late gentleman from Louisiana, the Honorable George Long. The location of this hospital goes back to that date. Back in 1955 we went to Oakland. We not only looked at the old hospital, but they took us over the mountain, so to speak, to look at this general area that had been recommended for the site that is before us today. It is my understanding that since that time all the veterans' organizations have agreed that this is an acceptable location for this hospital and since it has moved along on the basis that it will be located over there, certainly it is not in the interest of the Veterans' Administration hospital program to throw up these objections that are utterly without foundation, except that it just does not happen to be at a convenient location for some of the Members of the California delegation. That is about all there is to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN].

(Mr. COHELAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee's position. This is a dispute over the site location of a hospital. It has nothing to do with the desirability of having a hospital. I earnestly urge those of you who have any doubt about this matter to read the hearings on this subject that are available to you. You will find on page 1153 of the committee hearings a statement by Dr. Hardin Jones, a most distinguished medical scientist, who gets to the heart of the matter when he points out:

As you know, the Veterans' Administration, since World War II, has looked upon universities, medical science centers, and medical schools as a means of keeping quality of medical care for veterans at the highest possible mark, and associated with it is the policy of using the best talent in medicine that it can, such as Dr. Kay.

Dr. Kay is a noted urologist representing the Alameda-Contra Costa County

Medical Society, who also testified in favor of a restudy of the site location. The only thing that is involved here is a restudy of the site location. As indicated in the report, they expect to have a revised proposal submitted in January.

To show how important this is, Mr. Chairman, the only reason there was in the first place for any consideration of the Martinez area was that the Office of Defense Mobilization at that time called it a target area, which it no longer is. Not only has the situation changed, Mr. Chairman, but it has changed to exactly the opposite. Dr. Edward Teller, the distinguished physicist from the University of California testified, among other things, that a hospital properly located in an urban area could be of strategic value. He urged locating the hospital in or near the Berkeley campus of the University of California.

I oppose the amendment and I urge adoption of the committee's report.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

(Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, this 12-year program of the Veterans' Administration for the replacement and modernization of existing hospitals results from many years of study by veterans' organizations, hearings by the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and the suggestions of a subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations. The result of all this collective thinking can be found on page 553 of the hearings, where the following appears:

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES, \$75 MILLION

This appropriation provides for construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and becomes available for use after Presidential approval of individual projects or groups of projects. The facilities may include new and replacement hospitals, acquisition of sites, modernization of existing plants and fixed and initial portable equipment.

The Veterans' Administration "recognized the need for a comprehensive appraisal of requirements to modernize the VA hospitals and domiciliaries constructed prior to World War II. In October 1958, the Administrator appointed a task force to study and appraise jointly with the Bureau of the Budget the hospital and domiciliary replacement and modernization requirements through fiscal year 1971.

The task force concluded its study in June 1959 and recommended (with concurrence of the Bureau of the Budget) a program of replacement and modernization of our hospital system estimated to cost approximately \$900 million, including the unfunded portion of post-World War II new hospital program.

The Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget have agreed that this cost should be apportioned over a period of 12 years or at the rate of approximately \$75 million annually. This appropriation request is the first increment of funds for the plan and is the estimated additional amount needed in 1961 for the following projects and programs.

Mr. Chairman, I support the Saylor amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no opposition to the hospital as such, it is a question of which site should be selected. We do not agree with the Legislative Committee in their determination. The committee was given a copy of a letter written by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER]. The last paragraph of this letter reads as follows:

With further reference to the situation in California, the late Dr. George S. Long and members of his subcommittee visited the Oakland Hospital. Other members of this committee have visited the proposed site in Martinez, as well as the Oakland Hospital. Without going into details or indicating the views of particular individuals, I think it is sufficient to say that all of those who investigated the matter came to the conclusion that the best interest of the Veterans' Administration and the veterans of the area would be served by building the replacement of Oakland at or near the present site of the present hospital. In fact, most of the recommendations contemplate using the block adjacent to the present hospital.

You have here an intramural squabble between people in California.

Some want Martinez and some want Oakland. I think you should leave it up to the Legislative Committee and let them decide where the hospital should be. With respect to the statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY], namely, that he was a member of that group, yet, I suggest to him that this letter is dated less than a month ago, March 23, 1960, and it is pointed out by the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that as far as the committee is concerned, the report of the subcommittee which conducted the investigation has not yet been overruled. So that I say to you, if you want the Martinez site chosen by the Veterans' Affairs Committee, why do you not say so, so that the Committee on Appropriations is properly advised?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield.

Mr. AVERY. In the first place, I should advise the gentleman it is no longer my privilege to serve on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs which would make it a little difficult for me to bring in a recommendation from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. I have been further advised that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs felt generally that this policy had always been left to the Committee on Veterans' Administration to establish the site of the hospitals. They have never intervened before, and I would so construe the letter which the gentleman has read, not as being an intervention, but as a response in kindness and in consideration of an inquiry of a colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES].

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the hospital subcommittee and second ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and having served on that committee going on 10 years, I can tell the gentleman

from Illinois that it has never been the policy of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs to attempt to designate hospital sites. As the gentleman from Kansas has pointed out, the members of that subcommittee did go out, but they did not come back and make a recommendation to the full committee. The full committee has never advised or given an opinion to the Veterans' Administration as to where the hospital should be located. In view of what has transpired over the past few months, it seems feasible to proceed with the hospital where the Veterans' Administration has planned it, and not to deny the veterans in this area hospitalization. That is exactly what we are going to do if we do not approve of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Having served all of this time on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I hope the members of the committee will support the amendment so that we will not deny these veterans the hospitalization rights that they are entitled to, which in all probability they will not get if we continue this hassle.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, there is \$40 million carried in this bill for hospital construction. The hospital in the district of the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] in Branch Hill, Ohio, was approved because there was no controversy about it. But there is a controversy about the site location of the California hospital. The Public Works Appropriation Subcommittee on which I serve has always adhered to the rule that where there is a controversy, the committee defers or delays the matter for another year to see if the local people cannot get together and agree on the project. If you come here with a decision as to the location, I feel sure the committee will provide the funds. Under the circumstances, I think this matter should be deferred. There is \$40 million carried in this bill, as I said before, which is \$7½ million more than last year. As far as the hospital in the District of Columbia is concerned, I want to point out that we are saturated with construction right here at this time with some nine buildings going up in the District of Columbia with \$207,663,000 worth of construction. I feel the committee is generous, and certainly we want to provide for all the hospitals that are necessary. In the State of California, they would be demolishing a 750-bed hospital or a 500-bed hospital and they would be reducing the capacity at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the committee, I might say that this is a matter that is recognized as being controversial and is primarily a matter of location rather than of need.

I think I reported the case, and I heartily support this feature of the report. When we point out that this hospital is sorely need in California there can be no debate or question with regard to need; the sole matter revolves around

the question of where it should be located. I have heard and accept the recognition that the Veterans' Committee has not made a recommendation, that the Veterans' Administration has made a decision. It was in the budget, and for that reason I believe that the amendment is in order and a good one.

With regard to the other hospital involved I might point out that the hospital here in Washington while it is claimed to be needed, and as to that I will not quarrel with it, but the planned cost of construction is exceedingly high. However, there is a need for this hospital not only here but for hospitals in the whole program to the point where this \$900 million Veterans hospital program can be completed within 12 years.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, let us see what is involved in this. The amendment restores the amount from \$39 million, round figures, to \$75 million. It is for two hospitals. One of the hospitals is at Martinez, Calif., at a cost of \$11.7 million; and the other is in the District of Columbia at a cost in round figures of \$20 million.

As to California, read our report. It sets out why the hospital as proposed should not be built. You would demolish a 750-bed hospital and set up a 500-bed hospital when the veteran population in the area is growing. We think that is wrong. They ought to give it more consideration and they ought to build a thousand-bed hospital.

What I am trying to say is that they need a bigger hospital out there, but where? That is all that is involved, where?

The Legislative Committee in the past has set up a good policy and it is sound; you cannot get around it. It is good for science, it is good for the patients, it is good for the veterans to set up these hospitals near these great medical centers.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment ought to be voted down. The people back home ought to reconsider and if they cannot agree, and if the Legislative Committee cannot agree, then your little subcommittee will go out there ourselves in January and we will come back here, and then we will prayerfully submit a proposition to this House. Is not that fair enough?

As to the District of Columbia: Again we prayerfully ask you to vote down the amendment. Here is \$20 million for a 700-bed hospital, and it is the most expensive thing in the United States: \$28,200 per bed. Can you tie that any place?

Of course, you cannot expect our very distinguished newspapers here in the District of Columbia to oppose it: come easy, go easy, they do not care what it costs. You have a hospital in Baltimore, you have a hospital in Martinsburg, and a thousand-bed hospital in Richmond. You have veterans' beds set aside in Walter Reed Hospital and you have veterans' beds aside in Bethesda Naval Hospital.

You have that nice hospital here now. I have been out there myself and I

know what it is like. Certainly it is an old building, but there is no finer equipment any place in this country than there is in that hospital, and it is beautifully maintained. The staff does a beautiful job. It is well kept, it is nice to look at, neat, clean, well-painted and well-preserved. It will be an economic waste to throw that hospital out and wreck it. There are at least 5 or 10 more useful years of life in that building. It is a good building and it has a good plant.

You should bear in mind that a ceiling has been set on the number of beds by our distinguished President at 125,000. If you tear down this hospital and add another one, when you get through you are just going to have that figure of 125,000 beds. If you tear down ten or add five new, you still have that ceiling and it is going to be 125,000 beds.

The testimony before our committee is that this year and last year and the year before there was not a service-connected applicant in the entire United States who did not get admission right off the bat. Does anybody question that statement?

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully ask for a vote, and I hope that the pending amendment will be defeated. We will take care of the California situation in January and this one is not needed in the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SAYLOR) there were—ayes 82, noes 38.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. IKARD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. THOMAS) there were—ayes 31, noes 43.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Massachusetts?

Mr. JACKSON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Might I call to the attention of my friend that today is primary day in New Jersey. We follow this procedure in relation to all primary days, where there is any roll call other than on a rule or a quorum call on Monday or Tuesday, for instance, when there is a primary, that it go over until Wednesday. Now, my friend from California is so fair that I just think my calling the matter to the gentleman's attention would refresh his conscious mind.

Mr. JACKSON. May I say to the distinguished majority leader that a good many agreements are entered into with which some of us do not accord. The House has but very few weeks remaining to do a lot of very essential business, and it simply seems to the gentleman from California, who was not consulted on any agreement, nor do I expect to be consulted, that if we are going to dispose of the tremendous amount of work remaining before this Congress before the first part of July, that sometime we are going to have to start moving on it.

I realize that these agreements between the leadership are an essential part of the operation of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I know that the gentleman is one who respects leadership. But recognizing that today is a primary day in New Jersey, I am sure the gentleman will appreciate the practical exigencies and will see the justice of the situation, which holds for all primaries. As far as I am concerned, as the gentleman from California knows, I try to protect every Member, wherever there is a primary. It is not a question of party. Under the circumstances I think that this is the decent thing to do; it is the right thing to do.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, certainly I yield to no one in my high regard for the majority leader and for his fairness in matters of this kind. However, I repeat, if this serves no other purpose, Mr. Speaker, than to indicate the protest of many of us who also have primaries in the west coast, to whom this convenience is not accorded, then it will have served a purpose. I say that if we are going to move into this tremendous volume of work which we have, we must draw the line at some point and get some of the work accomplished.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I must say in all frankness to my friend that when I announced the program last week I said that should any rollcall be demanded on Tuesday, it would go over until Wednesday, because of the New Jersey primary. I take the same attitude as to any primary. And I am just as anxious as the gentleman is to get through. On the other hand, I recognize the practical situation that confronts all Members in connection with primaries. It may affect one Member one week, another Member another week.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the distinguished majority leader? If my objection holds, then certainly the vote would not be taken today. In any case, it would go over until tomorrow; is that not the case?

Mr. McCORMACK. If the gentleman objects to going over until tomorrow, this is the situation. The gentleman then is establishing a precedent which might operate in connection with all future primary days. I should prefer it if the gentleman would not do that. The rollcall might go over until tomorrow, but I would rather we did not follow that method.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, in deference to the gentleman—

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I would rather the gentleman put it in deference to the problem confronting the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts that further consideration of the bill go over until tomorrow?

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, may I further reserve the right to object to make one more observation?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. JACKSON. I shall not insist on it, but if it has served no other purpose I hope that it has called to the attention of the House that time is fleeting, that we have a tremendous amount of work, as the distinguished majority leader knows. I shall not object in this instance but I do hope we can get a little more accomplished in the few weeks remaining.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives

SIR: Desiring to be temporarily absent from my office, I hereby designate Mr. H. Newlin McGill, an official in my office, to sign any and all papers and do all other acts for me which he would be authorized to do by virtue of this designation and of clause 4, rule III of the House.

Respectfully yours,
RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

THE C. & O. CANAL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK BILL

(Mr. FOLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include an article.)

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to call to the attention of the Members of the House, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprint of a Na-

tional Geographic magazine article, "Waterway to Washington: The C. & O. Canal." The article appears in the Appendix of the April 6, 1960, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, beginning at page A3030. Written by Jay Johnston of the National Geographic staff, it contains a wealth of historic data about the C. & O. Canal that is helpful to the Members in appreciating H.R. 2331, "to establish the C. & O. Canal National Historical Park and Parkway." The bill will soon come to the floor for consideration.

Also, I call attention to the most recent report of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments, unanimously supporting the C. & O. canal bill, H.R. 2331. The full Board report and recommendations appears at page A3215 in the April 12, 1960, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

On April 8, 1960, the Washington Post carried the following report of the Board's action:

ADVISORY BOARD URGES FAST PASSAGE OF BILL TO SET UP C. & O. CANAL PARK

Creation of a new national historical park and a new national monument has been recommended by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments.

The Board yesterday forwarded to Interior Secretary Fred A. Seaton the following recommendations:

Early enactment of legislation, now before Congress, which would authorize establishment of a 15,000-acre C. & O. Canal National Historical Park, from the Nation's Capital through the mountains of Maryland. Seaton previously endorsed the legislation.

Designation of a Missouri area as Ozark Rivers National Monument. The proposed monument would include 113,000 acres along about 190 miles of the Current, Jacks Fork, and Eleven Point Rivers.

The Advisory Board also commended the Department for its efforts to secure congressional cooperation to provide essential protection of Rainbow Bridge National Monument, Utah, against irreparable physical and esthetic damage as the result of the construction of Glen Canyon Dam and urged that this effort be continued.

The Advisory Board is composed of 11 non-salaried members appointed by the Interior Secretary by direction of the Historic Sites Act of 1935. Its membership includes representatives competent in the field of history, archeology, architecture, and human geography.

The C. & O. Canal recommendation noted that the advisers were reiterating their 1955 call for protection of the historic waterway. They said the canal park unit is needed as a memorial to America's westward expansion and a monument to the canal area. The Board said it hopes that enactment of the pending legislation will enable the Nation to realize this park opportunity without further delay.

Another resolution noted that, as fine as the national park system is, it is not complete and there are significant areas of scenic, scientific, and historic significance that should be considered on a systematic basis for suitability and eligibility for inclusion in the system.

The Board urged that a "national park system more nearly adequate for the foreseeable needs of the United States . . . be planned and appropriate measures taken to acquire and conserve these irreplaceable portions of our national heritage before they are lost."

PANAMA CANAL

(Mr. WALTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, for many months, as chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, I have watched with increasing concern, the rising Red tide to the south of us that is now converging on the Isthmus of Panama. Thus, it has been with gratification that I have noted a growing understanding on the part of many Members of the Congress to this threat to hemispheric security as evidenced by their passage on February 2, 1960, by a vote of 381 to 12 of House Concurrent Resolution 455 concerning sovereignty over the Canal Zone territory.

Among those who have spoken out boldly in this regard, no one has presented a more comprehensive analysis of the questions involved than my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood]. His many statements on this matter over a period of years are a valuable source of documented information on our isthmian and Latin-American policies.

His latest contribution is a notable address on the "Panama Canal: Key Target of Fourth Front," on April 18, 1960, before the National Defense Committee luncheon meeting of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution at the Sheraton Park Hotel, in Washington, D.C.

Presiding over this distinguished gathering from various sections of the country was Mrs. Wilson K. Barnes, national defense chairman of the national society. The chairman of the committee on arrangements was Mr. B. Harrison Lingo.

In order that the full text of our colleague's latest contribution may be available to the Nation at large, especially to libraries, editorial desks, schools, colleges, universities, and Government agencies concerned with Isthmian Canal policy questions, I quote the indicated address:

On the morning of November 4, 1959, the people of the United States were surprised to read press dispatches from Panama about Canal Zone border violence on the previous day under large headlines, such as, "U.S. Troops Guard Canal Zone Against Mob." This news was not surprising to those in close touch with Isthmian developments.

Even though my studies had made it possible to foresee the disorders that occurred on November 3, 1959, and to warn proper authorities of the executive department as well as the Congress far in advance, it is indeed a sterile satisfaction to state that those grave disturbances occurred precisely on the day as predicted; precisely in the manner prophesied; and precisely with the results expected. It would have been far better had timely action by the Congress or Executive been taken to prevent this distressing incident from occurring.

Unfortunately, the events of that tragic day and the long series of developments leading to them have not been adequately presented by the mass media to the people of our Nation—a failure that has the savor of a conspiracy of silence. Because they are fundamental and transcend all lesser con-

siderations, their adequate clarification is imperative and requires some frank speaking.

In so doing, I wish to emphasize that I am not an enemy of Panama, nor of any just aspirations of its people, among whom I have made numerous and treasured friendships extending back many years. I sincerely trust that what I say today will add to public knowledge in both Panama and the United States and lead to better understanding of the issues involved.

JURIDICAL BASE OF U.S. ISTHMIAN CANAL POLICY

The foundations of our Isthmian canal policies are rooted in four centuries of history and rest upon three important canal treaties.

First. The Hay-Pauncefote Treaty of 1901 between Great Britain and the United States, which facilitated construction of the Panama Canal. In this agreement, Great Britain relinquished its own rights for construction and control of an Isthmian canal and recognized the exclusive rights of the United States thereto. The United States, in assuming this obligation, adopted the main points of the Convention of Constantinople of 1888 for the operation of the Suez Canal as the rules to govern the operation and management of the American canal. These provide that the canal shall be "free and open" to "vessels of commerce and of war" of "all nations" on terms of "entire equality" with tolls that are "just and equitable." It also authorizes the United States to protect it against "lawlessness and disorder."

Second. The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of November 18, 1903, between the Republic of Panama and the United States. On the part of Panama, this convention granted to the United States "in perpetuity" the "use, occupation, and control" of the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection, and, most significantly, as if the United States were the "sovereign of the territory" and to the "entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power, or authority." On the part of the United States, the main points for the purpose of this address were that it guaranteed the independence of Panama, which had just seceded from Colombia and whose existence depended on the protection of the United States and the success of the canal undertaking. The United States also was authorized to enforce sanitary ordinances and to maintain public order in the terminal cities of Panama and Colon and in the territories and harbors adjacent thereto in event of failure of the Republic of Panama to do so, as well as to acquire property within these cities and adjacent areas for canal purposes through the exercise of the right of eminent domain.

Third. The Thomson-Urrutia Treaty of April 6, 1914, proclaimed March 30, 1922, between the United States and the Republic of Colombia, the sovereign of the Isthmus prior to the Panama Revolution of November 3, 1903. This treaty aimed at removal of all misunderstandings growing out of the political events in Panama in November 1903, restoration of the cordial friendship that had previously existed between Colombia and the United States, and definition and regulation of their rights and interests with respect to the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad.

The negotiations of these three treaties were the contributions of some of the ablest men of their times. They knew the history of the Isthmus as a land of endemic revolution and political instability. They understood the lessons of the Suez Canal, and benefited by them in adopting policies for administering the Panama Canal. They

knew the difficulties experienced in the negotiations with Colombia for a satisfactory canal treaty, which was finally rejected by the senate of that country, and thereupon determined to solve permanently the problem of sovereignty in the Canal Zone.

With duality of control as originally proposed in the rejected Hay-Herran Treaty removed, the framers of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty were justified in feeling that what would have been a perpetual cause of conflict and recrimination, which always accompanies extraterritorial rights, had been eliminated forever.

The Canal Zone is a constitutionally acquired domain of the United States. Under our Constitution, the treaties and statutes that relate to its acquisition, the subsequent construction of the Panama Canal, and its perpetual operation, are "supreme law of the land." Moreover, the framers of the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty were far-visioned. They discriminated between the "grant" of the Canal Zone "in perpetuity" and the "life of this convention," which they realized would probably be modified. They even provided against the possibility of Panama entering "any union or confederation of states, so as to merge her sovereignty or independence," in which case the treaty provides that "the rights of the United States * * * shall not be in any respect lessened or impaired."

CANAL ZONE: U.S. GOVERNMENT RESERVATION

Despite the clear wording of the Panama Canal treaties, so many misconceptions of their key features have characterized press coverage in recent years, even including some of the most respected encyclopedias, that clarifications are essential. In this, the first fact of importance to note is that the original recommendation to secure control of the Canal Zone "in perpetuity" was made by the Isthmian Canal Commission in early 1902. This was followed by the Spooner Act, approved June 28, 1902, authorizing the President to secure by means of a treaty the "perpetual control" of the Canal Zone for the construction and "perpetual" maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal.

It is true that the preamble of the 1903 treaty acquiring the Canal Zone describes the "sovereignty of such territory as being actually vested in the Republic of Panama." This description was used, however, to indicate the transfer of sovereignty over the area from Colombia to Panama as the result of the secession of Panama from Colombia and thereby to show the authority of Panama to cede to the United States that jurisdiction for canal purposes. Certainly it was not used for the purpose of establishing the sovereignty of Panama over the Canal Zone after its occupation in 1904 by the United States.

The fact that U.S. sovereignty over the zone is absolute was clearly indicated by Bunau-Varilla, Panama's Minister to the United States and one of the principal draftsmen of the 1903 treaty, who stated: "After mature thought, I recognized that if I enumerated in succession the various attributes of sovereignty granted, I ran the risk of seeing in the (U.S.) Senate, some other attributes asked for."

"To cut short any possible debate I decided to grant a concession of sovereignty en bloc."

"The formula which seemed to me the best one was to grant to the United States in the Canal Zone 'all the rights, power, and authority which the United States would possess and exercise if it were the sovereign of the territory; to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any such sovereign rights, power and authority.'"

Thus, it is definitely established that the Canal Zone was not sold, ceded, or leased,

but granted in perpetuity to the United States for perpetual operation of the Panama Canal. Not only that, all privately owned properties in the Canal Zone were later bought by the United States, and these included the Panama Railroad.

In addition to the titles thus secured, Colombia, in the Thomson-Urrutia Treaty recognized the title to both the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad as "vested entirely and absolutely" in the United States "without any encumbrances whatever."

Moreover, President Taft, by Executive Order of December 5, 1912, pursuant to the 1903 treaty and the Panama Canal Act, declared that "all land and land under water within the limits of the Canal Zone are necessary for the construction, maintenance, operation, protection and sanitation of the Panama Canal."

All these points, Madam Chairman, and many others that could be stated, remove all doubt as to the sovereign control of the entire Canal Zone. Its status is that of a U.S. Government reservation with full and exclusive sovereign control vested in the United States. The only authorized symbol of such absolute authority is the flag of the United States.

SECRETARIES HAY, TAFT AND HUGHES: CANAL ZONE SOVEREIGNTY VIEWS

The current agitation about the sovereign control of the Canal Zone is not a new issue but an old one periodically dragged out of its tomb for political purposes. Notwithstanding the fact that this subject has been repeatedly clarified, recent references to Panama as the "titular sovereign" of the Canal Zone, or whatever that is, by high officials of our own State Department and others, cannot be dismissed as effusions of the ignorant, for they have been presented as reaffirmations of the views enunciated in 1906 by Secretary William Howard Taft. What are some of the key facts in the history of this matter?

Secretary of Government Tomas Arias of Panama, one of the revolutionary junta of 1903, in a note dated May 25, 1904, addressed to Gov. George W. Davis of the Canal Zone stated:

"The Government of the Republic of Panama considers that upon the exchange of ratification of the treaty for opening the interoceanic canal across the Isthmus of Panama, its jurisdiction ceased over the Zone." Ratifications of this treaty, it may be stated, were exchanged on February 26, 1904.

In spite of this clear, unequivocal declaration, Secretary Arias later presented the "sovereignty" question to the United States. In a comprehensive reply to the Panamanian Government on October 24, 1904, Secretary of State Hay asserted that "the great object to be accomplished by the treaty is to enable the United States to construct the Canal by the expenditure of public funds of the United States—funds created by the collection of taxes" and that "the position of the United States is that the words 'for construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and the protection of the said Canal' were not intended as a limitation on the grant, but are a declaration of the inducement prompting the Republic of Panama to make the grant" of the Canal Zone to the United States in perpetuity.

Though Secretary Hay mentioned the term, "titular sovereign of the Canal Zone," he stated that such sovereign is "mediatized by its own acts, solemnly declared and publicly proclaimed by treaty stipulations, induced by a desire to make possible the completion of a great work which will confer inestimable benefit on the people of the Isthmus and the nations of the world." He also stated that it was difficult to conceive of a country contemplating the abandonment of such a "high and honorable posi-

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

CONTENTS

Issued April 21, 1960
For actions of April 20, 1960
86th-2d, No. 72

Appropriations...1,2,13,19
ASC committees.....25
Civil defense.....5
Cooperatives.....21
Dairy industry.....26
Farm labor.....12
Farm program.....8,20,28
Foreign aid.....3,11,23
Foreign relations.....12
Forestry.....9
Interest rates.....4,27
Irrigation.....6,17
Lands.....18
Legislative program.....19
Mutual security....3,11,23
Postal rates.....16

Public Law 480.....12
Reclamation.....15,22
Recreation.....13,29
Research.....17
St. Lawrence Seaway.....24
Soil conservation.....14
Sugar.....7
Taxation.....19
Veterinary education....30
Wilderness areas.....10

HIGHLIGHTS: Sen. Dworshak urged increase in domestic sugar quotas. Sen. Humphrey criticized administration's farm policies. Sen. Mansfield urged increased re-forestation of national forests. Senate committee voted to report mutual security authorization bill. House passed independent offices appropriation bill. House debated mutual security authorization bill. Rep. Nelsen introduced and discussed farm bill.

HOUSE

1. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Passed with amendment this bill H. R. 11776. (pp. 7781-5) For items of interest to this Department see Digest 70.
2. COMMERCE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Disagreed to Senate amendments to this bill H. R. 10234; conferees were appointed. p. 7785 Senate conferees have been appointed.
3. MUTUAL SECURITY. Began debate on H. R. 11510, the mutual security authorization bill. pp. 7785-840
4. INTEREST RATES. Rep. Patman criticized the Treasury Department for not using an alternative method of financing their recent issuance of \$2 billion worth of 52-week bonds "on April 14th one day before income tax payments were scheduled." pp. 7840-2

5. CIVIL DEFENSE. Rep. Ikard urged restoration of an item of \$3,000,000 in the independent offices appropriation bill for Federal matching funds for beginning the combined Federal-State civil defense program. p. 7852
6. IRRIGATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. J. Res. 150, to permit the Secretary of the Interior to continue to deliver water to lands in the 3d Division, Riverton Federal Reclamation project Wyoming (H. Rept. 1528). p. 7853

SENATE

7. SUGAR. Sen. Dworshak urged enactment of legislation to extend the Sugar Act so that farmers may plan ahead, stated that in supporting sugar legislation he reserved "the right to seek additional domestic sugar-beet quotas for farmers of Idaho and other Western States, taking into account expanding needs of our growing population and the capacity of available processing facilities," and that the increase in quotas he would seek "would help considerably in allocations to farmers wanting to go into sugar-beet production for the first time." pp. 7758-9
8. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Humphrey criticized Administration farm policies, defended the Poage farm bill (The Family Farm Income Act of 1960) as a "fine, constructive proposal," and inserted an analysis of his own bill, S. 2502 (The Humphrey Family Farm Program Development Act), which he stated "brings farm programs into perspective with total food and fiber use." pp. 7726-30
9. FORESTRY. Sen. Mansfield criticized the reforestation program of the Administration, contended that there is a greater need for national forest reforestation than existed 10 years ago, and stated that "our forest budget is badly out of balance. Today over 4- $\frac{1}{2}$ million acres of national forests require reforestation." He also inserted tables showing the status of reforested areas, and "a series of letters between the Bureau of the Budget and the senior Senator from Montana (Mr. Murray) and letters from the Chief of the Forest Service," discussing the need for reforestation. pp. 7751-8
10. WILDERNESS AREAS. Sens. O'Mahoney and Allott discussed an amendment they intended to propose to S. 1123, the wilderness preservation bill, which Sen. O'Mahoney stated "retains safeguards to meet the future needs of national defense or the needs of a progressive economy," and provides "a statutory means of setting aside certain areas of the public lands which were designated as wilderness by the Forest Service ... prior to February 1, 1960." pp. 7716-7
11. MUTUAL SECURITY. The Foreign Relations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendments S. 3058, the mutual security authorization bill. The "Daily Digest" includes a table showing authorizations requested by the Administration as compared with authorizations in the House bill and the Senate committee bill. p. D322
The Foreign Relations Committee was granted permission to file a report on the bill by midnight Fri., Apr. 22. p. 7751
12. FOREIGN RELATIONS. Sen. Mansfield inserted a report he prepared after study mission to Mexico in 1955, including a discussion of the corn drought in Mexico, assistance under Public Law 480, and Mexican labor relations. pp. 7742-4
13. TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. The "Daily Digest" states that

House of Representatives

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 119:130: *The entrance of Thy words giveth light.*

Almighty God, who art always speaking unto us through Thy Holy Word, may this verse of Sacred Scripture, with its message of comfort and assurance, be unto us a revealing light and a sustaining power during all the hours of this new day.

Grant that the thoughts of our mind and the meditations of our heart may daily be tempered and disciplined by the entrance of Thy words, giving us the spirit of charity and kindness, of tolerance and patience, as we seek to solve the difficult problems of human relationships.

May Thy divine words illumine and transfigure our loftiest aims and aspirations with spiritual insight and understanding and bring them in tune with a great faith which will enable us to meet the unknown tomorrow, however dark, without fear or confusion.

Humbly we offer our prayer in the name of the Christ, our Lord, in whom Thy word became flesh. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 47]

Allen	Fisher	Moulder
Andersen,	Ford	Norblad
Minn.	Gavin	Powell
Barden	Grant	Prokop
Bonner	Holifield	Rogers, Tex.
Boykin	Horan	Rooney
Brewster	Jackson	St. George
Brock	Kelly	Short
Buckley	Keogh	Sisk
Burleson	King, Utah	Taylor
Carnahan	McGovern	Teague, Tex.
Celler	Mack	Teller
Chelf	Meador	Thompson, La.
Coffin	Morrow	Thompson, N.J.
Cooley	Metcalf	Utt
Davis, Tenn.	Mitchell	Willis
Derounian	Montoya	Withrow
Diggs	Moorhead	Young
Farbstein	Morris, N. Mex.	Younger
Fenton	Morrison	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 372 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the further consideration of the bill H.R. 11776, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole on yesterday which, without objection, the Clerk will report.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 34, line 23, after the word "Code", strike out "\$39,100,000" and insert "\$75,000,000".

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 218, nays 155, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—218

Adair	Conte	Griffiths
Addonizio	Cook	Gubser
Alexander	Cooley	Hagen
Alger	Corbett	Haley
Anfuso	Cramer	Halleck
Arends	Cunningham	Halpern
Asplnall	Curtin	Hargis
Auchincloss	Curtis, Mass.	Hays
Avery	Curtis, Mo.	Healey
Ayres	Dague	Hemphill
Bailey	Daniels	Henderson
Baker	Davis, Ga.	Herlong
Baldwin	Delaney	Hess
Barrett	Dent	Hiestand
Barry	Derwinski	Hoeven
Bass, N.H.	Devine	Hoffman, Ill.
Bates	Dingell	Hoffman, Mich.
Baumhart	Dixon	Holland
Becker	Dooley	Holt
Beckworth	Dorn, N. Y.	Holtzman
Belcher	Dorn, S. C.	Hosmer
Bennett, Fla.	Dowdy	Huddleston
Bennett, Mich.	Dulski	Jackson
Bentley	Dwyer	Jennings
Berry	Edmondson	Jensen
Betts	Fallon	Johansen
Blatnik	Farbstein	Johnson, Calif.
Bolton	Fascell	Johnson, Md.
Bosch	Fino	Judd
Bow	Flynn	Karth
Bray	Flynt	Kearns
Breeding	Foley	Keith
Broomfield	Forrester	Kilburn
Brown, Mo.	Fountain	Kitchin
Brown, Ohio	Frazier	Knox
Broynhill	Frelinghuysen	Kyl
Burdick	Friedel	Lafore
Byrne, Pa.	Fulton	Laird
Byrnes, Wis.	Garmatz	Landrum
Cahill	Gathings	Lankford
Canfield	George	Latta
Cederberg	Gilbert	Lesinski
Chamberlain	Glenn	Lindsay
Chenoweth	Goodell	Lipscomb
Chipperfield	Granahan	Loser
Church	Gray	McCulloch
Clark	Green, Pa.	McDonough
Collier	Griffin	

McDowell
McFall
McGinley
McIntire
Machrowicz
Malillard
Martin
Mason
Matthews
May
Michel
Miller, N.Y.
Milliken
Minshall
Moore
Morgan
Mumma
Nelsen
Nix
Norrell
O'Brien, N.Y.
Osmers
Ostertag
Pelly
Prost

Pillion
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Ray
Reece, Tenn.
Rees, Kans.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Saund
Saylor
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Siler
Simpson
Slack
Smith, Calif.

Smith, Kans.
Smith, Miss.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Springer
Stratton
Teague, Calif.
Thomson, Wyo.
Toll
Tollefson
Trimble
Ullman
Van Pelt
Van Zandt
Walnwright
Wallhauser
Weaver
Wels
Westland
Wharton
Whitener
Wldnall
Wilson
Zelenko

NAYS—155

Abbitt
Abernethy
Albert
Alford
Andrews
Ashley
Ashmore
Barr
Bass, Tenn.
Blitch
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bowles
Brademas
Brooks, La.
Brooks, Tex.
Brown, Ga.
Budge
Burke, Ky.
Burke, Mass.
Cannon
Casey
Chelf
Coad
Cohelan
Colmer
Daddario
Dawson
Denton
Donohue
Downing
Doyle
Durham
Elliott
Everett
Feighan
Flood
Fogarty
Forand
Gallagher
Gary
Gialmo
Green, Oreg.
Gross
Hardy
Harmon
Harris
Harrison
Hechler
Hogan
Holifield

Hull
Ikard
Inouye
Irwin
Jarman
Johnson, Colo.
Johnson, Wis.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Kasem
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kilday
Kilgore
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kowalski
Lane
Lennon
Levering
Libonati
McCormack
McMillan
McSweeney
Macdonald
Madden
Magnuson
Mahon
Marshall
Meyer
Miller, Clem
Miller,
George P.
Mills
Moeller
Monagan
Morris, Okla.
Moss
Multer
Murphy
Murray
Natcher
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill
Oliver
Passman

Patman
Perkins
Philbin
Pilcher
Poage
Porter
Preston
Price
Pucinski
Quigley
Rabaut
Rains
Randall
Reuss
Riley
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Roush
Rutherford
Santangelo
Scott
Selden
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Sikes
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Steed
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Taber
Thomas
Thompson, Tex.
Thornberry
Tuck
Udall
Vanik
Vinson
Walter
Wampler
Watts
Whitten
Wler
Williams
Winstead
Wolf
Wright
Yates
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—57

Allen
Andersen,
Minn.
Anderson,
Mont.
Barden
Baring
Bonner
Boykin
Brewster

Brock
Buckley
Burleson
Carnahan
Celler
Coffin
Davis, Tenn.
Derounian
Diggs
Evins

Fenton
Fisher
Ford
Gavin
Grant
Hebert
Horan
Kelly
Keogh
King, Utah

McGovern	Moulder	Teague, Tex.
Mack	Norblad	Teller
Meador	Powell	Thompson, La.
Marrow	Prokop	Thompson, N.J.
Metcalf	Rogers, Tex.	Utt
Mitchell	Rooney	Willis
Montoya	St. George	Withrow
Moorhead	Short	Young
Morris, N. Mex.	Sisk	Younger
Morrison	Taylor	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Ford against.
 Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. Hébert against.
 Mr. Brewster for, with Mr. Davis of Tennessee against.
 Mr. Brock for, with Mr. Keogh against.
 Mr. Horan for, with Mr. Buckley against.
 Mr. Derounian for, with Mr. Celler against.
 Mr. Gavin for, with Mr. Bonner against.
 Mr. Fenton for, with Mr. King of Utah against.
 Mrs. St. George for, with Mr. Carnahan against.
 Mr. Withrow for, with Mr. McGovern against.
 Mr. Younger for, with Mr. Rogers of Texas against.
 Mr. Sisk for, with Mr. Fisher against.
 Mr. Teller for, with Mr. Willis against.
 Mr. Allen for, with Mr. Moulder against.
 Mrs. Kelly for, with Mr. Anderson of Montana against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Andersen of Minnesota.
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Utt.
 Mr. Diggs with Mr. Taylor.
 Mr. Morris of New Mexico with Mr. Norblad.
 Mr. Powell with Mr. Marrow.
 Mr. Prokop with Mr. Meador.

Mr. HAGEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the House spent considerable time yesterday and today in discussing and voting on phases of the independent offices appropriations bill. This is as it should be, because the size of this appropriation and the diversity of the Government services it represents touch on all phases of American life.

I have been impressed, however, by the hard work and thorough study evident on the part of members of the Appropriations Committee who have handled the bill. I think we all owe a great deal to the energy and effectiveness of the committee headed by the able gentleman from Texas. We may disagree with specific actions that the committee has taken and attempt to convert the House to our views, but we should express our respect for the detailed study which members of the committee have done in our behalf.

I want to welcome the inclusion in this bill of funds to carry out construction needs in the Federal service across the country. I was disappointed a year ago when what I consider to be a short-sighted executive policy ruled that there would be no new starts in certain Federal construction areas. This delayed the building of a new Federal office building in Hartford, Conn., that has been desperately needed.

The existing building was constructed in the 1930's as a post office and courthouse. The work of both agencies has increased tremendously since that time. In addition, other agencies have grown and have required representation in Hartford. This has crowded working conditions at the present building and has forced the Government to rent outside quarters at what has been estimated as an annual cost ranging from \$290,000 a year to \$400,000 a year.

More than a dozen agencies are now housed in the present Federal building and others are located at 11 diverse sites around the city in rented quarters. Construction of this building, which has been recommended since 1956, when the Public Works Committee approved it, should solve this problem and result in savings to the Government and greater efficiency for the public it serves.

The action of the House today, then, is a step forward to meeting this need which has long existed. I know the construction of this new building has been programed by Hartford to fit into its plans for a greater city, tying in with redevelopment programs now underway, and I am happy that this 86th Congress has approved the Federal portion of this need. Again let me congratulate the members of the committee and thank the Members of the House.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the action just concluded on the Saylor amendment is, I believe, unfortunate insofar as it concerns construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital at Martinez, Calif.

Unless the Senate reverses this action, northern California veterans and their families will be far less better benefited than would otherwise have been possible. It is unfortunate that the issues involved in the location of a much-needed VA hospital in northern California have been obscured and confused through a legislative device by which the proposed Martinez project was lumped in the Saylor amendment with other projects in the District of Columbia and the State of Ohio. I recognize that the votes of many of my colleagues reflect a concern with one or the other of the latter projects, not a decision on the merits of the Martinez project.

As a result of the confusion resulting from this omnibus amendment, we have approved construction of a hospital in an out-of-the-way community of far less than 50,000 people with an existing medical community which can only be termed negligible in contrast to others in major population centers to be served by this facility. Indeed, this location was first chosen only because of a long-canceled civil defense dispersal directive and has been questioned by the Veterans'

Affairs Committee and opposed by the Appropriations Committee. By this vote we have bypassed years of effort by many of our colleagues to have this proposed site restudied in the light of what are, in fact, the basic considerations; that is, service to the veteran, availability of medical resources and accessibility to those who are to be assisted, the veterans themselves. By this vote we have ignored the thoughtful recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations.

So that the record will be available to our colleagues in the Senate who will now begin consideration of this and other projects in the 1961 independent offices appropriation bill, I wish to have reprinted the following portions of testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Independent Offices with reference to the Martinez VA hospital proposal.

The first item is my own summary statement. The second is the transcript of the subcommittee's discussion with Dr. Harold Kay, representative of the two-county medical association which represents the county which includes the city of Martinez, myself and my senior colleague, Congressman GEORGE P. MILLER. The third is the statement of Dr. Hardin Jones of the University of California which includes a letter from Dr. Edward Teller, both indicating the willingness of the university to extend to the Veterans' Administration its vast medical resources, resources which cannot ever be imagined to be paralleled in the small community of Martinez.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JEFFERY COHELAN

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, at this juncture I should like to introduce the prepared statement that I have for the record, and I shall make only one or two comments in the interest of time.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, for ourselves and for the public officials and civic leaders from Alameda County, Calif., who have traveled from our State specifically to appear here today, we wish to thank Chairman THOMAS, members of the committee, and Staff Assistant Homer Skarin for the courtesy that has been extended in making arrangements for our appearance.

Simply stated, I oppose relocation of the existing Oakland Veterans' Administration Hospital in Martinez, Calif., and urge restudy of the whole question of a site for the new replacement facility. Therefore, I appear today to oppose the President's budget request for funds to construct the new hospital in Martinez.

At the outset, let me say that all of us are primarily concerned with adequate and efficient hospitalization for veterans. We believe strongly that a new Veterans' Administration hospital is needed in the area now being served from Oakland. We subscribe to all arguments showing the need for more hospital beds for veterans. Let there be no mistake about that.

Where we do disagree with those who support the Martinez proposal is on the question of what location will best serve veterans who require hospitalization. I submit that this is the basis on which this long-continuing dispute should ultimately be decided.

Let me list several facts which make the case. Evidence documenting these facts will be presented and our witnesses present today are prepared to answer any questions that may arise.

1. Alameda County, which includes Oakland and Berkeley and several other cities—all part of a single metropolitan complex—is by far and without question the largest single urban area to be served by the new hospital.

2. The medical community in Alameda County is by far and without question the largest in the total area to be served.

3. Relocation of the new hospital facility in Alameda County is supported by municipalities within the county, by veterans groups within the county, and, finally, by Veterans' Administration doctors polled by the medical association which serves both of the two counties under consideration.

4. The one single reason why a site for the new facility was sought in an out-of-the-way location like Martinez in the first place no longer remains valid, i.e., dispersion for reasons of civil defense.

Those who seek construction of a new VA hospital in Martinez point out that the area to be served extends eastward into the Sacramento Valley and then northward even to the Oregon border, and would have us conclude from this that a hospital in Martinez, which is just far enough away from Alameda County's metropolitan area to be inaccessible by public-operated transportation, would somehow better serve communities 50, 100, and even 200 and more miles away than would a hospital in Alameda County.

The fallacy in this argument is that they would take the hospital away from the largest metropolitan area to be served with its unusual complex of medical and educational facilities, take it away just far enough to pose special transportation problems for veterans and their families, and still not provide a location appreciably more convenient to those other faraway areas.

Alameda County alone has a population of 899,200, while the next three most populous counties in the area to be served—specifically, Contra Costa County, San Joaquin County, and Sacramento County, which includes the city of Sacramento, the State capital—have a total combined population of only 1,105,900 spread over many, many miles indeed. These totals are official estimates of population as of June 30, 1959, from the office of the controller of the State of California.

I would add that this argument is also weakened by the fact that it fails to take into account the need for still another Veterans' Administration hospital in the Sacramento area. I believe the committee is well aware that the ratio in northern California is 742 veterans to each hospital bed, whereas the national average is only 183 veterans to each bed.

Another argument advanced by opponents of a new Veterans' Administration hospital in Alameda County is that heavy expenditures have already been made and it is, therefore, too late to pull out. It should be kept in mind that property purchased at Martinez involves a total cost of less than \$40,000. Even at that, this property is easily marketable and may well enable the Federal Government to turn a profit rather than suffer a loss in the event that a restudy indicates it should not be used. I cite the testimony of Mr. Robert L. Condon, Martinez attorney and former Congressman from the Sixth District of California, before your committee last year, at which time he said that this land now ranges in value between \$3,000 and \$3,500 an acre. It was purchased for \$1,500 an acre.

The second part of this same argument involves the architectural expenditures of some \$400,000 which have already been made. Here, again, it is alleged that this sum would be a loss in the event the Martinez site is not used. The point is refuted in the testimony of Mr. W. Ashbridge, VA Assistant Adminis-

trator of Construction, before the committee in February of 1959. On that occasion Congressman YATES asked why architectural planning for a hospital at Martinez was being continued since the Veterans' Affairs Committee might determine that the VA should not go ahead with that project.

Mr. Ashbridge replied, "Most of the plans will be used anyway." He then added, "The upper floors would be the same." The only conclusion that can be drawn from his testimony is that the \$400,000 outlay for architectural plans will not be much wasted, in the event that the Martinez project is set aside.

In closing I would like to refer to a letter to Chairman Thomas dated July 2, 1959, from Mr. Donald H. McLaughlin, chairman of the board of regents of the University of California, which has its home campus in Alameda County.

This letter, a copy of which was also sent to my office, advises that the university has for several years invited the Veterans' Administration to consider relocation of the Oakland VA hospital near the university. It further offers to combine resources—to make available the vast facilities already existing at the university—in order to provide a great medical service to veterans and simultaneously provide a clinical resource to the great laboratories of medical science at our university.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot emphasize too strongly that this additional reason for a complete restudy of the question of location of the new hospital is a very singular one and would itself warrant delay of construction at Martinez so that other sites can be considered.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DR. HAROLD KAY

Dr. KAY. I represent the Alameda-Contra Costa County Medical Association, which has a total membership of 1,597 medical practicing doctors; 1,284 of them in Alameda County, 313 in Contra Costa County.

There are 394 specialists in Alameda County, 175 in Contra Costa County.

Mr. COHELAN. Doctor, what is your medical specialty?

Dr. KAY. I am a urologist.

From the consultants to the VA hospital in Oakland, 54 come from Alameda County and 7, Contra Costa County at the present time.

Mr. MILLER. Doctor, do you know where these seven come from? Do they come from the western part of Contra Costa County, or do they come from the eastern part?

Dr. KAY. From the eastern part.

The Alameda-Contra Costa Medical Association has no preference as to the location of any governmental facility except insofar as it may affect patient care. It is quite clear and thoroughly agreed upon by all concerned that the veteran patient will be better served in areas in which there is a ready availability of a wide variety of medical specialty skills and a plentiful supply of these skills.

There can be little doubt that the above conditions exist in the Oakland-Berkeley metropolitan area whereas they do not exist to the same degree in any outlying area, including Martinez.

Although Martinez is adjacent to this medical metropolitan area, its location does compromise the ready availability of plentiful medical care of all types because it interposes the necessity of automobile travel.

Mr. THOMAS. In actual traveling time, what is the difference in time from the location of the present facility to the one that is now proposed?

Dr. KAY. Actual traveling time, one way, is approximately 30 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS. One way?

Dr. KAY. One way, sir. I am saying this as from the medical situation in Oakland we

have a majority of our doctors and specialists situated in an area called "Medical Pill Hill," which downtown is on approximately 30th Street; the medical facilities are at 14th Street. It is 8 blocks through traffic.

Mr. MILLER. How many hospitals are located there?

Dr. KAY. There are three hospitals located on Medical Pill Hill.

Mr. MILLER. And the Kaiser Hospital is only about 3 blocks away?

Dr. KAY. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER. These are the biggest hospitals in the East Bay area.

Dr. KAY. It is approximately 6 to 8 minutes to get to the hospital where from the same spot to get to Martinez would take anywhere from 40 to 50 minutes.

From the standpoint of the doctors presently in a consulting capacity at the veterans hospital in Oakland, a survey which was made last June informed us that of the 99 VA medical consultants, doctors in practice in Oakland, Berkeley, San Francisco, and Contra Costa County, 55 stated they would prefer to have the hospital remain in the Metropolitan Oakland area. Twelve stated they had no preference and seven indicated they would prefer the Martinez area.

Just as an addition, I might state to you that I am a consultant to the veterans' hospital in Livermore in urology. For the past 8 years, when we have had to do any delicate surgery, such as prostatic surgery, which we feel we should not do too far away, it has been necessary to transfer patients from Livermore Hospital to Oakland, necessitating more money in cost, et cetera, because we as doctors did not feel we should be that far away from that particular type of operation.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you very much, Doctor. You are a man of very few words, but you pack a lot of punch in them.

Dr. KAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF DR. HARDIN JONES

Mr. JONES. Thank you.

I am a general medical scientist. I am not a physician. I range in a number of different departments in our university because of the need for entering into medical problems from basic chemistry, basic mathematics, and all of these things that our university possesses at the moment in a very great wealth. This has been developing over the past 30 years, the fact that medical problems can be entered into directly from the basic sciences, and actually I am a member of the physics department, which is quite a stretch of the imagination. Physics does not usually relate to medicine, and has not for about 400 years. The name "physician" comes from the fact that physicians were usually physicists or scientists. We are getting back to that now. A number of us—Ernest Lawrence, who died about a year and a half ago, had a position formerly with the group I represent. His position was taken by Dr. Teller; the president of our university, chairman of the board of regents, the head of the biology department, Wendell Stanley, Dean Smith of the School of Public Health, and many others in the Berkeley campus, including Michael Goodman, have all gathered together our knowledge and expressions of needs for the university to try to work with the veterans hospital and the Veterans' Administration to show them the advantages of being with the University of California. They have been very sympathetic. As you know, there were commitments at the time we started to the Martinez site, largely arrived at through the Office of Defense Mobilization.

Since that time not only has the situation changed, but it has changed to exactly the opposite. Instead of talking about dispersal, there no longer could be any dispersal protection from the hydrogen bombs, but there

can be protection of the metropolitan centers if we have shelters built in the locations where the people are, so that Government buildings, and especially hospitals that are to be newly constructed, ought to have their lower floors built as bomb shelters.

We hope that these would not actually be needed, but they are needed in the sense that there is a certain probability that no one knows precisely how to calculate that we would have to use them this way, and the more such facilities we have, fortunately, the less likelihood we will have of using them because the more defense we really have the less vulnerable we are to attack.

Professor Teller has put these things very eloquently in a letter to you, Mr. THOMAS, some time back.

Mr. COHELAN. May I interject at this point, Mr. Chairman? I have a telegram from Dr. Edward Teller.

Mr. THOMAS. Read it into the record at this point.

Mr. COHELAN (reading):

"I understand that the matter of establishing and locating a veterans hospital in northern California is at present under consideration. It would be a great courtesy on your part if you would present to the Appropriations Committee my letter to you of July 16, 1959, in which I have given reasons for locating the veterans hospital in Berkeley."

I have attached to this telegram a copy of the letter to me in which he sets forth many of the reasons that Dr. Jones is reciting.

Mr. THOMAS. We will put that in the record.

(The information referred to follows:)

LIVERMORE, CALIF., March 16, 1960.

Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I understand that the matter of establishing and locating a veterans hospital in northern California is at present under consideration. It would be a great courtesy on your part if you would present to the Appropriations Committee my letter to you of July 16, 1959, in which I have given reasons for locating the veterans hospital in Berkeley.

EDWARD TELLER.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,

Livermore, Calif., July 16, 1960.

HON. ALBERT THOMAS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. THOMAS: The purpose of this letter is to express to you my interest and concern in the establishment and location of a veterans hospital in northern California. I understand that a location in Martinez has been considered and I also understand that a location close to the Berkeley campus of the University of California has been discussed. I would urge that this second location should actually be selected.

Apart from the extremely important primary purpose of such a hospital, it can also serve a further purpose whose long-range effects may become of the greatest possible significance. The hospital can be utilized as a research center to increase our medical knowledge. It is in such practical research centers that the battles for prevention and cure of disease are won. Such a research center, however, requires the full and close cooperation between the practical approach of the hospital and the more general approach of an academic institution.

By establishing the hospital close to the Berkeley campus of the University of California, cooperation could be established between this important hospital and one of the most outstanding campuses in the United States. Among the many research activities which could contribute to the greatest exploitation of the potentialities of the hospital, I will mention only the virus laboratory and the Lawrence radiation laboratory

of the university. In particular, the radioactive substances which have been first produced at the radiation laboratory have been used for many years in the Donner laboratory of the university for the study, diagnosis, and cure of a variety of diseases. The patients of this hospital would immediately profit from such a cooperation and benefits in the future would be even greater.

If you may permit me, I would like to bring up a second issue, in addition to the one I have just mentioned. Although I believe that an all-out nuclear war is, fortunately, not at all likely, it is still my conviction that we must be prepared for this terrible eventuality. I believe that a practical, cheap, and effective measure would be to establish well-protected and extensive shelter areas in the basements and subbasements of big public buildings. In a hospital these shelter areas could be utilized even in peacetime for a number of purposes, and the money invested in the shelter would, therefore, not be wasted even if we never had to take refuge in these shelters. I believe that with the help of advice from people competent in radiation and other effects of nuclear explosives, an effective and relatively inexpensive shelter basement could and should be added to the planned hospital. This would insure maximum safety of the patients and could, in fact, be of some help to the population in the immediate surrounding. More than that, the establishment of each such shelter could be made a step in a meaningful effort at defense, which in the long run would greatly improve the safety of our country.

A hospital properly located in an urban area could be of strategic value. In addition, some of the patients would certainly enjoy the wonderful opportunities of a cultural center like Berkeley. But the main reason why I am urging the location of the hospital in or near the Berkeley campus is the unique opportunity which would be afforded for the improvement of medical knowledge and for longer and happier lives for ourselves and our children.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD TELLER.

Mr. JONES. Our university could be called a postgraduate school of both medical research and training because we train medical scientists and we do need clinical facilities because all of the kinds of problems that we work on are medical problems. They cannot be dealt with abstractly in the laboratories. They are things that we have to form a wedding between the biochemist or mathematician and the physician who is in charge of the care of patients and looking for new ways of expressing solutions to existing problems.

I met, by chance, Dr. Shapiro, of the Veterans' Administration, in the hall. He is very much interested in the use of veterans hospitals and veterans everywhere to study the problem of aging. We cannot, as a matter of fact, study the problem of aging with regard to laboratory analyses because the need for analyses is so great. We are interested in whether human life can be extended in a meaningful way. My assignment with the University of California is dedicated solely to the problem of aging in human beings. This is the reason we want the veterans hospital located near us at the University of California.

We have, as a matter of fact, worked out a potentiality of sites. If you were interested, you can look at this enlarged map over here. There are at least 20 possible sites that show some feasibility in location near the University of California and near the other facilities that the veterans group would need.

As you know, the Veterans' Administration, since World War II, has looked upon universities, medical science centers, and medical schools as a means of keeping quality of

medical care for veterans at the highest possible mark, and associated with it is the policy of using the best talent in medicine that it can, such as Dr. Kay and representatives here with us this morning. These two things together are very important.

Whenever veterans hospitals are moved too far away so they cannot communicate with either medical science or the main streams of medicine, the hospitals then have less quality to offer to their attending patients. This is a sensible combination.

Now, I probably wouldn't be—not interested, I would be interested—but I would not be involved in the problem if it were not for the university need because my time is directed to things that are in science and education.

At the present time, no university, regardless of how wealthy it may be, or how much it may derive income from the tax rolls, can afford to use its income to build great medical centers. In the past, universities did this. This is because they were not so costly to maintain. At the present time there is a very great increase in cost. For research purposes, it may cost over \$100 a day to maintain a person in a hospital for observation.

This, multiplied by a thousand beds, means a very large figure. The State of California perhaps might do it except that there are no State hospitals available at the immediate time. The best opportunity we can see might be this particular veterans hospital. Certainly the Government is not going to build another veterans hospital in this area. This is an opportunity not only to get the best medical care to veterans, but also to have an association with the university which guarantees quality of care for the future and from the standpoint of the university and State needs in higher education, it is making the tax money do several things. I thoroughly believe that in justification of the tax expenditures, it ought to meet several needs simultaneously providing the first need is also cared for.

Mr. THOMAS. Doctor, you have a head full of sense. Go ahead and complete your statement.

Dr. JONES. Well, this is our hope, then, that we can forestall this unfortunate plan to build a veterans hospital where it really does not belong. Even though there is awkwardness in the present sense of asking you to withhold this appropriation—and this is very hard to do because I know veterans in California need hospitals. But it is better not to put the hospital where it will cost the taxpayers perhaps twice or three times as much money to maintain and also rob our State institutions of a very needed gain in education.

The State of California, as you know, is growing very rapidly. The population may double in the next 20 years. Already the University of California is thinking of adding to its campus another medical school. By the time that one is built we will have plans for another medical school because of the rapidly expanding population.

The University of California is also the trainee of larger numbers of medical scientists for countries abroad, a larger number than any other State in the United States. Therefore, it is very important to have the facilities with which to train these people.

I can point out that beginning at the same time that we undertook this project at the University of California a representative of the Veterans' Administration talked with our colleagues at Stanford University who also made the same overture to the Veterans' Administration and today or, perhaps, next week they will formally open the veterans hospital which is to be constructed at Palo Alto, a 1,000-bed hospital, built across the street from the recently established medical center. It can no longer afford to maintain a private hospital and they have built a

in a number of areas, the mutual security program is attaining its basic objectives.

Certain of the newer nations which in an effort to follow a neutralist policy had previously refused or played down U.S. assistance as being inconsistent with the policy of placating the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have now come to value our friendship and counsel as highly as our material assistance. They now have a better understanding of American policy. They recognize the United States has no objective except to assist them in maintaining their own independence and improving their living conditions. There have been several incidents which have shown that the attitude of the people of several of the nations of Asia toward the Soviet Union and Communist China has changed. The vociferous and occasionally spectacular claims of Communist propaganda have been too often more than offset by the flagrant aggressiveness and disregard of human welfare that have characterized Communist performance.

The obstacles confronting U.S. foreign policy have not been removed nor have final solutions been found for our problems. Nevertheless, there are indications that the governments and people of many of the less developed nations have come to recognize that the respect which we have demonstrated for their sovereignty and the priority we have given to the fundamental and the long range justify their trust.

There are those, however, who, while accepting the validity of the concept of foreign aid, have misgivings as to the ability of the United States to administer effectively a program of the magnitude and complexity of current mutual security operations. The Committee on Foreign Affairs has given a high priority to following up reports of waste and inefficiency in carrying out the program and has initiated legislation to correct some of the major deficiencies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 502.

(Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. TRIMBLE) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to H.R. 11510 and I intend to vote for this legislation as I have voted in the past for all measures designed to strengthen the free world in the continuing fight with the encroachments of Communist tyranny and Communist conspiracy.

However, inasmuch as this legislation authorizes the continuation of certain activities of the Development Loan Fund, I wish to bring to the attention of the House an apparently erroneous statement contained in the report of the Special Study Mission of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs regarding certain loans made by the Development Loan Fund for the housing of immigrants from the Netherlands in Australia.

On yesterday I received from my very good friend and former associate in the erection of the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, the Honorable Harold Holt, Treasurer of the Commonwealth of Australia, a letter

clarifying the matter and under unanimous consent I include Mr. Holt's letter in the RECORD at this point:

COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA,
TREASURER,
April 13, 1960.

The Honorable Congressman
FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman, Subcommittee No. 1,
Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C., U.S.A.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WALTER: We have been somewhat disturbed by certain statements contained in the report of the special study mission of the House Committee of Foreign Affairs concerning the loan made to the Netherlands Government by the U.S. Development Loan Fund for the housing of Dutch migrants in Australia.

The relevant sections of the report, as supplied to us by the Australian Embassy in Washington, read as follows:

"UNWISE USE OF DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND FOR RESETTLEMENT PROGRAMS IN AUSTRALIA

"The study mission had an opportunity to visit several homes built for Dutch settlers in Sydney, Australia. The building of these homes is the result of a \$3 million loan from the Development Loan Fund to the Netherlands Government at 4 percent (our Government is paying 5 percent). These homes were supposed to be refugee homes, and we expected to find something similar to our low-rental housing units, but instead, we found two- and three-bedroom brick homes with tile roofs and concrete runways all with carports. These homes are being sold to Dutch settlers by the Australian Government for 20 percent down and 27 years to pay, at 5 percent.

"This loan does not meet the eligibility standards set up for the Development Loan Fund, requiring that loans from Development Loan Fund should be made to underdeveloped countries. The economic condition of both the Netherlands Government and the Australian Government is as good or better than that of the United States. The study mission recommends that the eligibility standards for Development Loan Fund loans not be waived in the future."

Apart from the other misstatements, we were particularly concerned to note the specific reference to the sale of homes to Dutch settlers by the Australian Government. The fact is, of course, that the Australian Government is in no way involved in these transactions.

The homes in question are being erected for Dutch migrants by private builders or the migrants themselves. Finance is being provided from proceeds of the loan and matching funds from the Australian banks, and distributed through the medium of co-operative building societies set up in the respective states for this purpose.

We are assured by the Netherlands authorities that the agreement concluded with the Development Loan Fund stipulated that houses should conform with local building regulations and standards and the agreement incorporated conditions which have the obvious intention of preventing the construction of substandard or refugee-type houses. It is hardly necessary for me to stress that at no time did the Dutch or we contemplate the erection of such dwellings.

The Study Mission claims that the loan was intended for the building of homes for refugees. I am informed, however, that the agreement stipulates that the homes must be made available to "Dutch immigrant families." Refugees are not mentioned in the agreement, although Dutch migrants from Indonesia qualify for loans.

Less than 25 percent of the houses built in Australia under the agreement are of brick. The majority are timber framed and

sheeted with timber or asbestos cement. They comply with local Government and building society regulations including limitation of amount of loan.

Neither the Netherlands Government nor the Australian Government derives any profit from the U.S. loan moneys, all of which are spent for the benefit of migrants.

I felt I should let you know the facts for your own personal satisfaction and also in order that you may be in a position to remove any misunderstanding which has arisen and which may still exist in some quarters as a result of the Study Mission's report.

With my kindest regards.

Yours sincerely,

HAROLD HOLT, Treasurer.

I am glad to note, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Holt has also written in the same manner to Mr. C. Douglas Dillon, our able Under Secretary of State, who has shown broadness of vision and full realization of the merits of this loan. Mr. Dillon has helped some of us who were interested in this matter to achieve excellent results. He has greatly contributed to the cooperation between the United States and two countries which we are proud to count among our most faithful allies and best friends—Australia and the Netherlands.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Arkansas has stated, this resolution makes in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 11510, the so-called mutual security or foreign aid authorization bill. The total authorization contained in the measure is a little better than \$4.1 billion.

I know of no opposition to this rule. I am sure that most Members of the House know the position I have taken on this legislation for a great many years, therefore I am not going to discuss that angle.

I call the attention of the House to the fact that once the authorization bill is passed then, of course, the Appropriations Committee will have to bring in, in its own wisdom and under its own power and judgment, an appropriation bill to carry the funds that are authorized by this legislation for mutual security and foreign aid expenditures.

I think it only proper and fair that I call the attention of the Members to the fact the Appropriations Committee has consistently reduced the amount of appropriations far below that which has been authorized for mutual security purposes.

I should also mention the fact that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee handling the appropriations authorized under this legislation, has notified the various House Members in writing that something like \$8.1 billion have been made available for foreign aid purposes during the present fiscal year which ends on June 30. Of course, the present authorization bill deals only with mutual security funds for the new fiscal year which starts on July 1.

Perhaps it may be of interest to the House to also know that in the hearings before the Rules Committee, when the

great medical research center, but across the street is the hospital which provides the critical materials for this entire venture which is the veterans hospital, which has just been completed.

This is the kind of thing we want to do for the University of California. It is rather unfortunate that the Oakland Veterans Hospital, in having been replaced, is moving in actually the opposite situation. Here is a situation where this companion hospital is going to be relatively magnificently equipped but not associated with the Stanford University—whereas, the present plan for continuing this hospital will become something of a veterans hospital constructed 50 years ago where they were out in the woods. We need it near the University of California where it will save millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. THOMAS. That was a very fine statement, Doctor.

Dr. JONES. Thank you, sir.

Mr. RHODES. Dr. Jones, are you speaking for the administration of the University of California?

Dr. JONES. I do not speak directly for the administration but I represent an informal group. The way the University of California has to operate is that these things are dealt with rather informally and, as a matter of fact, invitations have come from both the board of regents and the president of the university. However, after these things are worked to the point of surface solution, then action will be taken by the University of California.

These statements by no means complete the case against the Martinez hospital proposal. Rather, they only serve to point up several salient arguments and will, I believe, cause interested colleagues to read in full the testimony before the subcommittee which occurs on pages 1123 through 1169, of Hearings on Independent Offices Appropriations for 1961, part 2, of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

I say again that it is unfortunate for the veterans of northern California that the factual considerations involved in this issue have been obscured.

I sincerely hope that the matter will be carefully reviewed and reconsidered by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, my vote adverse to the adoption of the Saylor amendment is not because I want the hospitalization program for our veterans to receive less in funds nor less than the very best of facilities and the most modern hospital buildings most advantageously located.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, all during my 14 years in this House I have steadfastly supported advance steps in programs designed for our veterans. This fact is well known to you, my colleagues, and likewise to the veteran leaders and to the veterans themselves.

But our Appropriation Committee has held extensive hearings on this matter and recommend a further study of the site question—Chairman THOMAS says not over 6 months.

This is not too long to make as sure as possible a serious blunder shall not be made.

The hospital should be located available to the veterans and their families and visitors and medical staff, so as to be reached by transportation at minimum of cost and time and trouble to all

concerned. The University of California has personnel and facilities which need not be duplicated, if the hospital is on their side of the bay.

Granting the proposal by the Saylor amendment would earlier mean, possibly, commencement of construction, by a few months, the Saylor amendment only provides for 500 beds in a new building at Martinez. The present Oakland hospital has a 750-bed capacity and northern California needs at least 750 beds in any new hospital to be built. This is one reason I vote no. Instead of reducing the number of beds in California for veterans, we need to increase same.

I have received reports frequently from veterans' organizations and veteran leaders about the shortage of hospital beds. It should not be so. But, we cannot improve the very bad need now existing all over our State of California, for more hospital beds, by building a new one with less bed capacity, by 250 beds than the present one, proposed to be abandoned now furnishes.

I want the congressional committee to have the additional 6 months to further study the site to be chosen. I am not unwilling to vote more money for a new veterans' hospital than that proposed.

And, Mr. Speaker, as a great need exists in northern California, so, our need also exists in southern California. The need daily increases. Let us not authorize a hospital with fewer beds than we now have. We need more beds.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10234) making appropriations for the Department of Commerce and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PRESTON, THOMAS, CANNON, BOW, and TABER.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FAIR LABOR STANDARDS

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Fair Labor Standards have permission to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1960

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 502 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11510) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may need.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 502 provides for the consideration of H.R. 11510, to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended. The resolution provides for an open rule, waiving points of order, with 4 hours of general debate.

H.R. 11510 authorizes \$1,318,400,000 for carrying forward certain portions of the mutual security program. In addition to the parts of the program included in this authorization the Executive is requesting total appropriations of \$2,720,100,000 against authorizations already in effect, of which \$2 billions for military assistance and \$700 million is for the Development Loan Fund.

The authorization is \$136,500,000 less than the amount requested by the Executive and \$41,942,000 less than the amounts appropriated for these same items last year.

The bill contains a number of amendments to the basic legislation intended to tighten the administration of the program as well as provisions giving additional guidance to, or imposing new limitations on, the Executive with respect to future operations.

In evaluating the request for the authorization of additional funds for economic assistance and in reviewing the military assistance program, the Committee on Foreign Affairs gave primary consideration to the administration of the mutual security program. Most of the American people and the majority of the Congress recognize the soundness of the concept of assisting the military forces of nations determined to resist aggression and of providing economic aid to countries when their present status or future development are of importance to the United States.

Although one result of increasing emphasis on review and evaluation of the program has been the disclosure of a number of instances of waste in particular projects or operations, there was also developed encouraging evidence that, in spite of its operating deficiencies

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11776

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 21, 1960

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry
5 independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, cor-
6 porations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending
7 June 30, 1961, namely:

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE

MOBILIZATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; and not to exceed \$900,000 for expenses of travel; \$24,700,000, of which \$185,000 shall be available for the Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Committee: *Provided*, That one contract for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), for not to exceed one person, may be renewed annually at a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS

OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

For expenses necessary to enable other Federal agencies to perform such civil defense and defense mobilization functions as may be designated by the Office of Civil and Defense

1 Mobilization, including payments by the Department of
2 Labor to State employment security agencies for the full cost
3 of administration of defense manpower mobilization activi-
4 ties, \$6,250,000.

5 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

6 For financial contributions to the States for civil defense
7 purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,
8 as amended, to be equally matched with State funds,
9 \$10,000,000, of which none shall be allocated to the States
10 pursuant to section 205 of said Act.

11 EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

12 For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing,
13 distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense
14 materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of
15 the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended,
16 \$6,950,000.

17 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

18 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
19 studies and research to develop measures and plans for
20 evacuation, shelter, and the protection of life and property,
21 as authorized by section 201 (d) of the Federal Civil Defense
22 Act of 1950, as amended, including services as authorized
23 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),

1 \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which
2 not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available to complete the
3 two-year program of fallout shelter prototype construction.

4 No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be avail-
5 able for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of
6 warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed
7 specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense
8 Mobilization.

9 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

10 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

11 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

12 For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board,
13 including contract stenographic reporting services; employ-
14 ment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; hire,
15 operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; purchase
16 (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor
17 vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
18 of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals
19 not to exceed \$50 per diem; \$7,285,000.

20 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT 21 AUTHORIZATION)

22 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compen-
23 sation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board
24 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958

1 (49 U.S.C. 1376) , as is payable by the Board, \$60,000,000,
2 to remain available until expended.

3 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$22,-
6 000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
7 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; not to exceed \$10,000
8 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private
9 physicians on a fee basis; payment in advance for library
10 membership in societies whose publications are available to
11 members only or to members at a price lower than to the
12 general public; not to exceed \$77,000 for performing the
13 duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19,
14 1940 (54 Stat. 767) ; reimbursement of the General Services
15 Administration for security guard services for protection of
16 confidential files; and not to exceed \$5,000 for actuarial
17 services by contract, without regard to section 3709, Revised
18 Statutes, as amended; \$19,230,000: *Provided*, That no part
19 of this appropriation shall be available for the Career Ex-
20 ecutive Board established by Executive Order 10758 of
21 March 4, 1958, as amended.

22 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
23 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and
24 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and

1 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established
2 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

3 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
4 Service Commission shall be available for printing the Official
5 Register of the United States.

6 INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EM-
7 PLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

8 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
9 Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended,
10 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary
11 General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of
12 other international organizations, certain information con-
13 cerning United States citizens employed, or being considered
14 for employment by such organizations, including services as
15 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
16 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$400,000: *Provided*, That this appro-
17 priation shall be available for advances or reimbursements
18 to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil
19 Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation
20 for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive
21 order: *Provided further*, That members of the International
22 Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual
23 transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence
24 authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended,

1 while traveling on official business away from their homes
2 or regular places of business, including periods while en route
3 to and from and at the place where their services are to be
4 performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in sections 281
5 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of
6 the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed to apply
7 to any person because of appointment for part-time or in-
8 termittent service as a member of the International Organiza-
9 tions Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Commis-
10 sion as established by Executive Order 10422, dated January
11 9, 1953, as amended.

12 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

13 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May
14 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of
15 August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775),
16 \$2,316,000.

17 GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES

18 HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

19 For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund" of
20 Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as
21 authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health
22 Benefits Act (73 Stat. 713), \$2,500.000, to remain avail-
23 able until expended.

1 PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DIS-
2 ABILITY FUND

3 For financing the annuity benefits and increases, during
4 the current fiscal year, provided by the Act of June 25,
5 1958 (72 Stat. 218), \$46,329,000, to be credited to the
6 civil service retirement and disability fund.

7 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES
8 LIFE INSURANCE FUND

9 Not to exceed \$250,000 of the funds in the "Em-
10 ployees' Life Insurance Fund" shall be available for
11 reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for ad-
12 ministrative expenses incurred by the Commission during
13 the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal
14 Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended
15 (5 U.S.C. 2091-2103): *Provided*, That this limitation
16 shall include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act,
17 notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law
18 85-377 (5 U.S.C. 2094 (c)).

19 FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY
20 EXPENSES

21 For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency,
22 not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses
23 for research and development and for establishment of air
24 navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the
25 Federal Airport Act; purchase of twenty passenger motor

1 vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed \$5,000 for
2 representation allowances and for official entertainment; and
3 purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; \$365,245,000:
4 *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation,
5 funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other
6 public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred
7 in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

8 ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

9 For an additional amount for the acquisition, establish-
10 ment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of
11 air navigation facilities, including the initial acquisition of
12 necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and fur-
13 nishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers
14 and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at
15 remote localities where such accommodations are not avail-
16 able (at a total cost of construction of not to exceed \$50,000
17 per housing unit in Alaska) ; purchase of five aircraft; and
18 the initial flight checking of air navigation facilities and the
19 transportation by air to and from and within Alaska and the
20 Territories of the United States of materials and equipment
21 secured under this appropriation; \$152,500,000, to remain
22 available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be
23 credited to this appropriation funds received from States,

1 counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private
2 sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air
3 navigation facilities.

4 GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF
5 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

6 For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority
7 granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to
8 enter into contracts, \$80,000,000, to remain available until
9 expended.

10 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

11 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
12 research, development, and service testing, including con-
13 struction of experimental facilities and acquisition of neces-
14 sary sites by lease or grant, \$64,000,000, to remain available
15 until expended.

16 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL
17 AIRPORT

18 For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-
19 nance, improvement and protection of the Washington
20 National Airport, including purchase of one passenger motor
21 vehicle, for replacement only, for police-type use which may
22 exceed by \$300 the general purchase price limitation for
23 the current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of
24 uniforms; and arms and ammunition; \$3,230,000.

1 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES INTERNATIONAL
2 AIRPORT

3 For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-
4 nance, improvement and protection of the Dulles Interna-
5 tional Airport, including purchase of four passenger motor
6 vehicles, of which three for police-type use may exceed by
7 \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the
8 current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of uni-
9 forms; and arms and ammunition; \$2,450,000.

10 CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

11 For necessary expenses for construction at Washington
12 National Airport, including acquisition of land, \$4,500,000,
13 to remain available until expended.

14 GENERAL PROVISION

15 During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations
16 to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the
17 Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified
18 in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C.
19 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Admin-
20 istrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance and
21 operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and
22 aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized
23 by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C.
24 2131).

1 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the
4 Commission as authorized by law, including land and struc-
5 tures (not to exceed \$23,000), special counsel fees, im-
6 provement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not
7 to exceed \$14,600), services as authorized by section 15 of
8 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and purchase
9 of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replace-
10 ment only, \$12,935,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed
11 \$2,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for a
12 special ultra-high frequency television study and shall remain
13 available until June 30, 1962.

14 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission,
17 as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor
18 vehicles, \$7,532,000, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be
19 available for special counsel and services as authorized by
20 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
21 but at rates not exceeding \$50 per diem for individuals.

22 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

23 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

24 For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commis-
25 sion, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as author-

1 ized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by
2 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
3 \$7,415,000: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appro-
4 priation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter
5 provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds
6 are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such reso-
7 lution to finance the cost of such investigation.

8 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office;
11 including rental or lease of office space in foreign countries
12 without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the
13 Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and serv-
14 ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2,
15 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$41,150,000.

16 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

17 OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

18 For necessary expenses of real property management
19 and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings
20 in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises;
21 moving Government agencies (including space adjustments)
22 in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer
23 of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and
24 disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests
25 therein; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of

1 August 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521); \$160,850,000: *Pro-*
2 *vided*, That this appropriation shall be available, without
3 regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as
4 amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to buildings, or
5 parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appropriation for
6 "Emergency operating expenses".

7 REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

8 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
9 alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pur-
10 suant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479),
11 including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves
12 and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent
13 thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites acquired for public
14 buildings; preliminary planning of projects by contract or
15 otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equip-
16 ment; \$58,000,000, to remain available until expended:
17 *Provided*, That for the purposes of this appropriation, build-
18 ings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase
19 Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) shall be considered
20 to be public buildings.

21 CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

22 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to
23 construct public buildings projects and alter public build-
24 ings by extension or conversion where the estimated cost for
25 a project is in excess of \$200,000 pursuant to the Public

1 Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), including equipment
2 for such buildings, \$144,836,000, to remain available until
3 expended: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be
4 available for public buildings projects at locations and at
5 maximum construction improvement costs (excluding funds
6 for sites and expenses) as follows:

7 Post office and Federal office building, Camden, Arkan-
8 sas, \$633,250;

9 Courthouse and Federal office building, San Francisco,
10 California, \$37,286,100;

11 Courthouse and Federal office building, Hartford, Con-
12 necticut, \$7,636,400;

13 Federal office building, Miami, Florida, \$7,076,250;

14 Post office and courthouse, Thomasville, Georgia,
15 \$1,094,000;

16 Border station, Jackman, Maine, \$289,850;

17 Border station, Van Buren, Maine, \$284,750;

18 Border station, Vanceboro, Maine, \$254,150;

19 Immigration and Naturalization Service center, (con-
20 struction and alteration) Detroit, Michigan, \$874,650;

21 Border station, Sweetgrass, Montana, \$586,500;

22 General Services Administration stores depot annex,
23 Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$469,200;

24 Post office and courthouse, Bismarck, North Dakota,
25 \$3,224,050;

- 1 Federal office building, Toledo, Ohio, \$3,867,700;
2 Post office and courthouse (construction and alteration),
3 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$5,601,500;
4 Courthouse and Federal office building, Memphis, Ten-
5 nessee, \$9,587,150;
6 Border station, El Paso, Texas, \$1,055,700;
7 Post office and Federal office building, Dayton, Wash-
8 ington, \$282,200: *Provided further*, That the foregoing
9 limits of costs may be exceeded to the extent that savings are
10 effected in other projects, but by not to exceed 5 per centum.

11 SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

12 For an additional amount for expenses necessary in con-
13 nection with the construction of public buildings projects
14 not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in
15 the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and
16 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings
17 projects by contract or otherwise, \$25,000,000, to remain
18 available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed
19 \$5,500,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used for

1 clearing the site and installing footings for the authorized
2 public building project at Chicago, Illinois.

3 PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

4 For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other
5 obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the
6 Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C.
7 356), \$4,000,000.

8 OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

9 For necessary expenses of personal property manage-
10 ment and related activities as authorized by law and not
11 otherwise provided for, \$3,716,500: *Provided*, That not to
12 exceed \$3,243,500 of any funds received during the current
13 or preceding fiscal year for deposit under section 204 (a) of
14 the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of
15 1949, as amended, and not otherwise disposed of by law,
16 shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and
17 shall be available for necessary expenses in carrying out the
18 functions of the General Services Administration under the
19 said Act, with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess
20 and surplus personal property.

1 EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

2 For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for
3 operation of the stores depot system and other procurement
4 services, including contractual services incident to receiv-
5 ing, handling, and shipping warehouse items, \$22,950,000.

6 OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND
7 RECORDS SERVICE

8 For necessary expenses in connection with Federal rec-
9 ords management and related activities as provided by law,
10 including reimbursement for security guard services, and
11 contractual services incident to movement or disposal of
12 records, \$9,420,000.

13 OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC
14 UTILITIES SERVICE

15 For necessary expenses of transportation and public
16 utilities management and related activities, as provided by
17 law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the
18 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to
19 exceed \$75 per diem for individuals, \$2,375,000.

20 STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

21 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions
22 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50
23 U.S.C. 98-98b), during the current fiscal year, for trans-

1 portation and handling, within the United States (including
2 charges at United States ports), storage, security, and main-
3 tenance of strategic and critical materials acquired for or
4 transferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant
5 to section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development
6 and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704 (b)), for carry-
7 ing out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act
8 of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462), relating to machine tools
9 and industrial manufacturing equipment for which the Gen-
10 eral Services Administration is responsible, including
11 reimbursement for security guard services, services as au-
12 thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
13 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed \$2,948,000 for operating
14 expenses, \$30,000,000, with which shall be merged the
15 unobligated balances of funds remaining available under this
16 head on June 30, 1960: *Provided*, That no part of funds
17 available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank
18 storage facilities: *Provided further*, That any receipts from
19 sales or otherwise during the current fiscal year shall be
20 promptly deposited into the Treasury.

21 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

22 For expenses of executive direction for activities under
23 the control of the General Services Administration, \$240,000.

1 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER
2 PRESIDENTS

3 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August
4 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$250,000: *Provided*, That the
5 Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Sec-
6 retary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to
7 carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such
8 Act.

9 REFUNDS UNDER RENEGOTIATION ACT

10 For refunds under section 201 (f) of the Renegotiation
11 Act of 1951 (50 U.S.C. App. 1231 (f)), \$900,000, to
12 remain available until expended.

13 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

14 Funds available to General Services Administration for
15 administrative operations, in support of program activities,
16 shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a
17 single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That
18 costs and obligations for such administrative operations for
19 the respective program activities shall be accounted for in
20 accordance with systems approved by the General Account-
21 ing Office: *Provided further*, That the total amount deposited
22 into said account for the fiscal year 1961 from funds made
23 available to General Services Administration in this Act
24 shall not exceed \$13,000,000: *Provided further*, That
25 amounts deposited into said account for administrative oper-

1 ations for each program shall not exceed the amounts in-
2 cluded in the respective program appropriations for such
3 purposes.

4 GENERAL PROVISIONS

5 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the
6 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)
7 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,
8 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from
9 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129) ;
10 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to
11 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the
12 General Services Administration, issued by public author-
13 ities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in
14 respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator
15 deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the
16 request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be pro-
17 vided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and
18 (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and
19 transferred to the General Services Administration, in con-
20 nection with property transferred to the General Services
21 Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50
22 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so
23 transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

24 Appropriations under the head "Construction, Public
25 Buildings Projects" shall be available for acquisition of

1 buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation or
2 otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, or
3 for other approved extension and conversion projects outside
4 the District of Columbia.

5 Funds available to the General Services Administration
6 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

7 No part of any money appropriated by this or any other
8 Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Govern-
9 ment shall be used during the current fiscal year for the pur-
10 chase within the continental limits of the United States of
11 any typewriting machines except in accordance with regula-
12 tions issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Prop-
13 erty and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

14 Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made
15 available to the General Services Administration for the cur-
16 rent fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other
17 such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be in-
18 creased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided*, That
19 such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and
20 shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$2,000,000.

21 Appropriations available to any department or agency
22 during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, in-
23 cluding maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be
24 available for reimbursement to the General Services Admin-
25 istration for those expenses of renovation and alteration of

1 buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements,
2 performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of
3 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law.

4 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

5 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

6 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

7 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administra-
8 tor, including rent in the District of Columbia; services as
9 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
10 U.S.C. 55a) ; and purchase of two passenger motor vehicles
11 for replacement only; \$10,327,000: *Provided*, That neces-
12 sary expenses of inspections and of providing repre-
13 sentatives at the site of projects being planned or under-
14 taken by local public agencies pursuant to title I of the
15 Housing Act of 1949, as amended, projects financed through
16 loans to educational institutions authorized by title IV of the
17 Housing Act of 1950, as amended, and projects and facilities
18 financed by loans to public agencies pursuant to title II of
19 the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be
20 compensated by such agencies or institutions by the payment
21 of fixed fees which in the aggregate will cover the costs of
22 rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose shall
23 be considered nonadministrative; and for the purpose of pro-

1 viding such inspections, the Administrator may utilize any
 2 agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or pay-
 3 ment for such services from such institutions, or the Admin-
 4 istrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropriations
 5 or funds against which such charges have been made, but
 6 such nonadministrative expenses shall not exceed \$2,900,000.

7 URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

8 For grants in accordance with the provisions of section
 9 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, \$4,000,000.

10 RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS (PAYMENT TO 11 REVOLVING FUND)

12 For payment to the revolving fund established pur-
 13 suant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as
 14 amended (40 U.S.C. 462), \$6,000,000.

15 GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

16 For an additional amount for payment of grants as
 17 authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended
 18 (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), \$150,000,000.

19 HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY (PAYMENT TO REVOLVING 20 FUND)

21 For payment to the revolving fund established pursuant
 22 to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, \$5,000,000.

1 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

2 ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

3 For the payment of annual contributions to public hous-
4 ing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United
5 States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410),
6 \$140,000,000.

7 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

8 For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Ad-
9 ministration, \$13,050,000, to be expended under the author-
10 ization for such expenses contained in title II of this Act.

11 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

12 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

13 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce
14 Commission, including not to exceed \$5,000 for the employ-
15 ment of special counsel; services as authorized by section
16 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates
17 not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals; and purchase of
18 not to exceed thirty-three passenger motor vehicles of which
19 twenty-seven shall be for replacement only; \$19,777,000, of
20 which not less than \$1,567,000 shall be available for ex-
21 penses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not

1 less than \$1,094,500 shall be available for expenses neces-
2 sary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Provided*,
3 That Joint Board members and cooperating State commis-
4 sioners may use Government transportation requests when
5 traveling in connection with their duties as such.

6 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

7 ADMINISTRATION

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of
10 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, includ-
11 ing hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$4,900,-
12 000 for expenses of travel; and uniforms or allowances there-
13 for, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as
14 amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; \$166,500,000.

15 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

16 For contractual research, development, operations, tech-
17 nical services, repairs, alterations, and minor construction,
18 and for supplies, materials, and equipment necessary for the
19 conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and
20 development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space
21 Administration; and purchase of forty-five passenger motor

1 vehicles, of which twenty-nine shall be for replacement only;
2 \$602,240,000, to remain available until expended: *Pro-*
3 *vided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available
4 for payment of salaries of National Aeronautics and Space
5 Administration personnel.

6 CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

7 For construction and equipment for the National Aero-
8 nautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or
9 condemnation of real property as authorized by law, \$107,-
10 275,000, to remain available until expended.

11 GENERAL PROVISIONS

12 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made
13 available to the National Aeronautics and Space Adminis-
14 tration by this Act may be transferred to any other such
15 appropriation, but the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation
16 shall not be thereby increased.

17 NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

18 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

19 For the operation and maintenance of properties under
20 title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, \$40,-
21 000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases,
22 or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the

1 United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so long as
2 funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing
3 purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act
4 of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not
5 be effective.

6 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

7 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

8 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
9 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42
10 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including award of graduate fellow-
11 ships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
12 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50
13 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
14 and reimbursement of the General Services Administration
15 for security guard services; \$160,000,000, to remain avail-
16 able until expended: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount
17 not less than \$30,250,000 shall be available for tuition,
18 grants, and allowances in connection with a program of sup-
19plementary training for secondary school science and mathe-
20matics teachers: *Provided further*, That not to exceed
21 \$1,600,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used to
22 purchase foreign currencies which accrue under title
23 I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance
24 Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the pur-
25 poses authorized by section 104 (k) of that Act.

1 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-
4 cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as
5 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
6 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for indi-
7 viduals, \$2,870,000.

8 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allow-
11 ances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131),
12 and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
13 of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$8,525,000.

14 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For expenses necessary for the operation and mainte-
17 nance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title
18 I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62
19 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by
20 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a);
21 purchase of eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement
22 only, including one at not to exceed \$4,000; not to exceed
23 \$61,536 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board;
24 and \$19,140 for the National Advisory Committee on the
25 Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists;

1 \$30,278,400: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year,
2 the President may exempt this appropriation from the pro-
3 visions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised
4 Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be
5 necessary in the interest of national defense.

6 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

7 GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

8 For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad-
9 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses
10 incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uni-
11 forms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; reim-
12 bursement of the General Services Administration for secu-
13 rity guard service; and not to exceed \$67,000 for preparation,
14 shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic
15 displays, moving pictures, and other visual education infor-
16 mation and descriptive material, including purchase or
17 rental of equipment; \$153,500,000: *Provided*, That no part
18 of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-
19 two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided fur-*
20 *ther*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay
21 educational institutions for reports and certifications of at-
22 tendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess
23 of \$1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and
24 attending such institution.

1 MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS

2 OPERATING EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary for administration of the medical,
4 hospital, domiciliary, special service, construction and supply,
5 research, and employee education and training activities, and
6 expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical re-
7 search, as authorized by law, \$30,000,000, of which \$17,-
8 000,000 shall be available for medical research: *Provided,*
9 That \$1,000,000 of the foregoing appropriations shall re-
10 main available until expended for prosthetic testing and
11 development.

12 INPATIENT CARE

13 For expenses necessary for the maintenance and opera-
14 tion of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and for the care
15 and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration
16 in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Admin-
17 istration as authorized by law, including the furnishing of
18 recreational articles and facilities; maintenance and operation
19 of farms; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities
20 in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of
21 the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either
22 by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and pur-
23 chase of materials; purchase of ninety-four passenger
24 motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allow-

ances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1,
1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State or
Territorial homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38,
United States Code, for the support of veterans eligible for
admission to Veterans Administration facilities for hospital
or domiciliary care; \$817,021,000, plus reimbursements:
Provided, That allotments and transfers may be made from
this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and
Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them under the
various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such
amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of bene-
ficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

OUTPATIENT CARE

For expenses necessary for furnishing outpatient care to
beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, as authorized
by law; purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replace-
ment only; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as author-
ized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); \$86,481,000.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF SUPPLY DEPOTS

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
of supply depots, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as
authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), \$2,500,000.

1 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

2 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,
3 and allowances (including burial awards authorized by sec-
4 tion 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence
5 allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under
6 any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based
7 thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and
8 annuities, the administration of which is now or may here-
9 after be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the
10 payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections
11 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended,
12 \$3,800,000,000, to remain available until expended.

13 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

14 For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans
15 as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment
16 Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and
17 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equip-
18 ment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38,
19 United States Code, \$344,000,000, to remain available
20 until expended.

21 VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

22 For military and naval insurance, for national service
23 life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-

1 disabled veterans insurance, \$48,800,000, to remain avail-
2 able until expended: *Provided*, That certain premiums pro-
3 vided by law to be credited to the "Military and naval
4 insurance" or "National service life insurance" appropria-
5 tions shall hereafter be credited to appropriations granted
6 under this head which shall be subject to the same statutory
7 provisions and shall be available for the same purpose as
8 formerly applied to the appropriations for "Military and naval
9 insurance", "National service life insurance", and "Service-
10 men's indemnities".

11 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

12 For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants
13 in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United
14 States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treat-
15 ment of veterans, \$1,500,000.

16 CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY
17 FACILITIES

18 For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and
19 for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and ex-
20 tending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the
21 Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth
22 in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States
23 Code, \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appropriations so augmented.

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for "Inpatient care" and "Outpatient care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code), for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under such appropriations.

No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Veterans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

1 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-
2 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons except
3 beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits
4 to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the
5 appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Adminis-
6 trator of Veterans Affairs.

7 INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

8 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are ex-
9 pendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific
10 limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such
11 travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth there-
12 for in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations:
13 *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel per-
14 formed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal
15 boards of the Selective Service System, or to travel per-
16 formed in connection with the investigation of aircraft acci-
17 dents by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

18 SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this
19 title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling
20 a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held
21 by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of
22 the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period
23 of active military or naval service and has within

1 ninety days after his release from such service or from hospi-
2 talization continuing after discharge for a period of not more
3 than one year made application for restoration to his former
4 position and has been certified by the Civil Service Commis-
5 sion as still qualified to perform the duties of his former posi-
6 tion and has not been restored thereto.

7 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available
8 by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase
9 or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new of-
10 fices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this
11 limitation shall not apply to programs which have been ap-
12 proved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

13 TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

14 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,
15 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the
16 limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each
17 such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to
18 make such contracts and commitments without regard to
19 fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the
20 Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may
21 be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the
22 Budget for the fiscal year 1961 for each such corporation
23 or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

1 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

2 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXAMINATION

3 EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

4 Not to exceed a total of \$1,943,000 shall be avail-
5 able for administrative expenses of the Federal Home
6 Loan Bank Board, and shall be derived from funds available
7 to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in
8 the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and
9 receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration,
10 the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home Loan
11 Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years,
12 and the Board may utilize and may make payment for
13 services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the
14 Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insur-
15 ance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government
16 (including payment for office space) : *Provided*, That all
17 necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship
18 of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan
19 Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of pro-
20 ceedings under section 5 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan
21 Act of 1933 or section 407 of the National Housing Act and
22 all necessary expenses (including services performed on a
23 contract or fee basis, but not including other personal serv-
24 ices) in connection with the handling, including the pur-

1 chase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal
2 home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of,
3 or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the
4 Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-
5 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes here-
6 of: *Provided further*, That hereafter expenses of the Board
7 in making studies or investigations specifically directed by
8 law, or requested by the Congress or either House thereof or
9 by a committee of either House, including services authorized
10 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
11 shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses: *Provided*
12 *further*, That members and alternates of the Federal Savings
13 and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reimburse-
14 ment from the Board as approved by the Board for trans-
15 portation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of or
16 concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid
17 not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided*
18 *further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this
19 Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore speci-
20 fied, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the
21 Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance
22 with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of
23 July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449): *Pro-*
24 *vided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses for the

1 examination of Federal and State chartered institutions
2 (other than special examinations determined by the Board
3 to be necessary) shall not exceed \$8,141,000.

4 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
5 SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

6 Not to exceed \$787,500 shall be available for ad-
7 ministrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual
8 basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation,
9 properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection
10 with liquidation of insured institutions or preparation for
11 or conduct of proceedings under section 407 of the National
12 Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived
13 from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action
14 for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of
15 losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and ex-
16 penses, and payments for administrative expenses of the
17 Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board
18 to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said
19 Corporation may utilize and may make payment for services
20 and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal
21 Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and
22 other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwith-
23 standing any other provisions of this Act, except for the
24 limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administra-
25 tive expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall

1 be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV
2 of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724-
3 1730), and such other obligations of said corporation shall
4 not exceed \$887,800.

5 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

6 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL

7 FACILITIES CORPORATION

8 Not to exceed \$20,000 shall be available during the
9 fiscal year 1961 for all administrative expenses of the
10 Corporation (including use of the services and facilities
11 of Federal Reserve banks), to be computed on an accrual
12 basis, and to be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, cap-
13 italized expenditures, expenses in connection with the
14 acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improve-
15 ment, or disposition of real or personal property belonging
16 to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, expenses
17 of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection
18 with the performance of legal services, and all administrative
19 expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies.

20 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECON-

21 STRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION

22 FUND

23 Not to exceed \$40,000 (to be computed on an accrual
24 basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of
25 Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General

1 Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1
2 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the cur-
3 rent fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the
4 liquidation of said functions: *Provided*, That as used herein
5 the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to
6 include all salaries and wages, services performed on a con-
7 tract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including
8 the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative
9 offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of services
10 performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the
11 termination of contracts or in the performance of legal
12 services: *Provided further*, That the distribution of adminis-
13 trative expenses to the account shall be made in accordance
14 with generally recognized accounting principles and prac-
15 tices.

16 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY
17 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
18 THE ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS
19 Not to exceed \$1,260,000 shall be available for
20 all administrative expenses, which shall be on an ac-
21 crual basis, of carrying out the functions of the Admin-
22 istrator under the program of housing loans to educational
23 institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as

1 amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d), but this amount shall
2 be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the
3 Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Fed-
4 eral home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the
5 meaning of the Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance
6 Corporation (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12
7 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary
8 of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the
9 United States.

10 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
11 THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

12 Not to exceed \$477,000 of funds in the revolving
13 fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amend-
14 ments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for admin-
15 istrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of
16 payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve
17 banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan
18 banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act
19 creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of
20 August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has
21 been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a de-
22 pository of public money of the United States.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
2 THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDAT-
3 ING PROGRAMS)

4 During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$139,500
5 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this
6 amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case
7 of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Gov-
8 ernment and legal services on a contract or fee basis and
9 of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve
10 banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the
11 Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-
12 loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of
13 the Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Fed-
14 eral Deposit Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which
15 has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a
16 depository of public money of the United States.

17 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
18 NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

19 Not to exceed \$6,550,000 shall be available for
20 administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual
21 basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses
22 (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed
23 on a contract or fee basis) in connection with the
24 issuance and servicing of securities, depreciation, properly
25 capitalized expenditures, fees for servicing mortgages, ex-

1 penses (including services performed on a force account,
2 contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal serv-
3 ices) in connection with the acquisition, protection, opera-
4 tion, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or
5 personal property belonging to said Association or in which
6 it has an interest, cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other
7 expenses of persons employed outside of the continental
8 United States, expenses of services performed on a contract
9 or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal serv-
10 ices, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other
11 Government agencies, and said Association may utilize and
12 may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal
13 Reserve banks and other agencies of the Government: *Pro-*
14 *vided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to
15 the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance
16 with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

17 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
18 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRA-
19 TION

20 For administrative expenses in carrying out duties im-
21 posed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed \$8,450,000 of
22 the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration
23 shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing
24 Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or
25 allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September

1 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) : *Provided*, That
2 funds shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to
3 exceed \$1,500) : *Provided further*, That nonadministrative
4 expenses of all kinds regardless of source classified by section
5 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, including
6 all appraisal fees regardless of source or method of financing
7 shall not exceed \$50,000,000.

8 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
9 TIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

10 Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such ex-
11 penses by title I of this Act shall be available for the
12 administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administra-
13 tion in carrying out the provisions of the United States
14 Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401-1433) ;
15 purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized
16 by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C.
17 2131) ; and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor
18 vehicle for replacement only: *Provided*, That necessary
19 expenses of providing representatives of the Administra-
20 tion at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with
21 the construction of such non-Federal projects by public
22 housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be
23 compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees
24 which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs
25 of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such serv-

1 ices, and expenditures by the Administration for such
2 purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and
3 funds received from such payments may be used only for
4 the payment of necessary expenses of providing representa-
5 tives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal
6 projects: *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public
7 Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act,
8 in carrying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed
9 \$1,200,000.

10 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

11 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in
12 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
13 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used
14 for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support
15 or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

16 SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in
17 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
18 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to
19 pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel
20 work in excess of the number that would be provided by a
21 ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five,
22 or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent em-
23 ployees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided*,
24 That for purposes of this section employees shall be con-
25 sidered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-

1 time or more in personnel administration consisting of
2 direction and administration of the personnel program;
3 employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and
4 classification; employee relations and services; committees
5 of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners;
6 wage administration; and processing, recording, and
7 reporting.

8 SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this
9 Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-
10 poration or agency included in this Act, shall be used for
11 construction of fallout shelters in Government-owned or
12 leased buildings except where specifically provided.

13 This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices
14 Appropriation Act, 1961".

Passed the House of Representatives April 20, 1960.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

APRIL 21, 1960

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

June 15, 1960

8. LANDS; ELECTRIFICATION. The Government Operations Committee approved two reports, "Land Appraisal Practices, Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management, Arizona" and "Electric Power Contract for Yellowstone National Park." p. D557
9. APPROPRIATIONS; ITEM VETO. Rep. Schwengel spoke in support of legislation to give the President authority to veto individual items in appropriation bills, and reviewed the history of the item veto as it has been used in the various States. pp. 11831-3

SENATE

10. MILK; PRICE SUPPORTS. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee reported with amendment S. 2917, to modify the price support level for milk and butterfat (S. Rept. 1592). p. 11705
11. COTTON; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS; LAND GRANT COLLEGES. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) the following bills: p. D554
- H. R. 12115, to extend the present minimum national marketing quota for extra-long staple cotton to the 1961 crop;
- H. R. 11646, with amendment, to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton by defining certain offenses in connection with the sampling of cotton classification and providing a penalty provision;
- S. 3117, to treat all basic agricultural commodities alike with respect to the cost of remeasuring acreage allotments; and
- S. 3450, relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and mechanic arts, to increase the authorized appropriations for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions.
12. PERSONNEL. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 3485, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation costs for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the U. S. (S. Rept. 1584). pp. 11705
- The Government Operations Committee reported with amendment H. R. 766, to amend existing laws so as to modify the strict penalty provision in title 5, U. S. Code, for the use of Government-owned vehicles and aircraft for other than official purposes and give to the heads of departments or agencies the discretion of fixing the disciplinary action in any given case (S. Rept. 1587). p. 11705
- The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported an original bill, S. 3672, to increase the salaries of Federal classified and postal employees (S. Rept. 1590). p. 11705
- The Post Office and Civil Service Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 7758, to improve the administration of overseas activities of the Government by providing for the establishment of a coordinated and uniform system for more effectively compensating Government employees for additional costs, and for hardships and inconveniences, incident to their working assignments in overseas areas and providing for uniformity of treatment for all overseas employees to the extent justified by relative conditions of employment; and S. 3421, relating to payment of death benefits under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act. p. D555
13. FORESTRY. The Agriculture and Forestry Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. J. Res. 95, providing for the acceleration of the reforestation programs of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. p. D554

Sen. Goldwater commended the Forest Service on their work in creating "a very unique playground out of land that was of little value to either the citizenry or the Forest Service" and suggested that similar programs throughout the U. S. would be of value. pp. 11712-3

14. WATERSHEDS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee approved the following watershed projects: Caney Creek, Ky.; Chippewa Creek, Ohio; Ischua Creek, N. Y.; Mill Creek, Pa.; North Broad River, Ga.; North Fork of Little River, Ky.; and West Fork, Clarks River, Ky. p. D554
15. WILDLIFE; CHEMICAL PESTICIDES. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted to report with amendment (but did not actually report) S. 3473, requiring consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service and appropriate State agencies prior to instituting programs using chemical pesticides in biological control. The "Daily Digest" states that this bill was amended by the substitution of the language of H. R. 12419, a similar bill which has been reported by the House. p. D555
16. DEFENSE DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Began debate on this bill, H. R. 11998, but deferred final consideration until today, June 16. pp. 11784-5
17. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report with amendments to the full committee this bill, H. R. 11389. p. D554
18. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. A subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee voted to report with amendments to the full committee this bill, H. R. 11776. p. D554
19. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee voted to report with amendment (but did not actually report) S. 3228, relating to issuance of certificates of convenience and necessity by the ICC to certain common carriers by motor vehicle. p. D555
The Banking and Currency Committee reported with amendment S. 3278, to amend the Housing Act of 1954 to assist State and local governments and their instrumentalities in improving mass transportation services in metropolitan areas (S. Rept. 1591). p. 11705
20. BOTANICAL GARDEN. The Public Works Committee reported with amendment S. 2919, to authorize the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution to study and investigate the desirability and feasibility of establishing a national tropical botanical garden in Hawaii (S. Rept. 1589). p. 11705
21. INFORMATION; PUBLICATIONS. The Government Operations Committee reported without amendment S. 3579, to authorize agencies of the Government of the U. S. to pay in advance for required publications (S. Rept. 1583). p. 11705
Received a report by the Comptroller General "Refusals to the General Accounting Office of Access to Records of the Executive Departments and Agencies" (S. Doc. 108). p. 11707
22. CONTRACTS; PURCHASING. The Government Operations Committee reported with amendment S. 3487, to amend the "Anti-Kickback Statute" to extend it to all negotiated contracts (S. Rept. 1585). p. 11705
23. LANDS. Received from the Defense Department proposed legislation to provide for the withdrawal from the public domain of lands in the Ladd-Eielson, Big Delta,

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

CONTENTS

Issued June 20, 1960
For actions of June 17 and
June 18, 1960

86th-2d, Nos. 111 and 112

Acreage allotments.....21		
Adjournment.....18,45		
Administrative orders...30		
Alaska railroads.....17		
Annuities.....23		
Appropriations..2,10,17,39		
Area redevelopment.....52		
Botanic garden.....36		
Casein.....4		
Contracts.....34		
Cotton.....19		
Cry price supports....20		
Defense production.....32		
Desert lands.....31		
Farm labor.....7,17,49		
Farm loans.....33		
Farm program....9,15,17,51		
Flood control.....3		
Food additives.....17,30		
Foreign aid.....10		
Fruits and nuts.....14		
Government orders.....4		
Grain storage.....43		
Household quarters.....23		
Housing.....40		
Humane slaughter.....54		
Imports.....4,14		
Miss River Basin.....10		
Information.....27,50		
Organizations.....8		
Land grant colleges.....37		
Lands.....13,31,33		
Legislative program....17		
Life insurance.....6		
Livestock.....34		
Marketing.....16		
Minerals.....29		
Motor carriers.....17		
Mutual security.....10		
Oceanographic research.....23		
Pay raise.....1		
Personnel..1,6,12,23,46,56		
Pesticides.....22		
Point Four Youth Corps..10		
Postal rates.....25		
Property.....17		
Public debt.....5,44		
Public Law 430.....57		
Public works.....47		
Publications.....42		
Reports.....41		
Research.....23,55		
Small business.....16,43		
Social security.....53		
Supplemental appropriations.....17		
Taxation.....5,44		
Technical cooperation...10		
Transportation.....11,26		
Travel costs.....23		
Vehicles.....35		
Watersheds.....24		
Wheat.....15,22		
Wool.....4		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed: Federal pay bill; Labor-Hew appropriation bill; omnibus flood control bill. Senate committee reported general Government matters and independent offices appropriation bills. House Rules Committee cleared Poage farm bill. House passed mutual security appropriation bill. (Highlights continued on page 7.)

SENATE - June 17

- FEDERAL PAY BILL.** Passed, 62-17, this bill, H. R. 9883, without amendment. The bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 12053-4, 12062-101
Rejected the following amendments:
By Sen. Carlson, 28-54, to provide for an increase averaging 6% rather than 7½% for classified employees. pp. 12063-71
By Sen. Ellender, 19-63, to limit increases to employees whose salary is not over \$10,000. pp. 12071-8
By Sen. Ellender, 23-58, to eliminate legislative employees from the bill. pp. 12078-82
By Sen. Church, to confine the bill to postal workers, 22-58. pp. 12082-8
By Sen. Dirksen, 11-70, to authorize the President to adjust pay to make it comparable to that in private enterprise. pp. 12088-97

Rejected, 21-56, a motion by Rep. Ervin to recommit the bill with instructions to report it back in separate bills for (1) postal and (2) other employees. pp. 12097-101

As passed, the bill includes provisions as follows: Provides for a general increase of $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ in the pay for Government employees. Increases salaries of the chief legal officers of departments from \$19,000 to \$20,000. Establishes the position of Administrative Assistant Secretary in HEW. Provides 5 additional supergrades in ICC.

2. APPROPRIATIONS. Passed, 63-6, with amendments the/ bill, H. R. 11390. Senate conferees were appointed. pp. 12177, 12224, 12230-43

Labor-HEW appropriation

The Appropriations Committee reported with amendments H. R. 11389, the ~~general Government matters appropriation bill (S. Rept. 1610)~~, and H. R. 11776, the independent offices appropriation bill (S. Rept. 1611). p. 12045

3. FLOOD CONTROL. Passed, 70-5, with amendments H. R. 7634, the omnibus flood control and rivers and harbors bill (pp. 12177-224). A letter from Assistant Secretary Peterson to Sen. Bush, comparing distribution of approved installation cost for flood prevention measures with that proposed in the Uniform Cost-Sharing Act, was inserted in the Record. (pp. 12218-222). Senate conferees were appointed (p. 12224).
4. IMPORTS. Agreed to conference reports on the following bills: H. R. 9881, to extend the existing law relating to free importation of personal and household effects brought into the U. S. under Government orders (p. 12225). H. R. 9322, to make permanent the existing suspension of duties on certain coarse wool (pp. 12225-6). H. R. 9862, to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe-last roughing or for shoe-last finishing and for 3 years on casein (pp. 12226-30).
5. PUBLIC DEBT; TAXATION. Began debate on H. R. 12381, to extend for 1 year the public debt limit and the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates. pp. 12243-50
6. LIFE INSURANCE. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported without amendment S. 3421, to amend the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act so as to provide authority for the Commission to determine claimants if no claim is filed (S. Rept. 1609). p. 12045
7. FARM LABOR. The names of Sens. Humphrey, Hart, Douglas, McNamara, Murray, Dodd, Proxmire, Clarke, and Young of Ohio were added as cosponsors of S. 3666, to extend the Mexican farm labor program for 2 years and to amend it to provide certain safeguards for the protection of domestic agricultural workers. pp. 12051, 12252
8. INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS. Both Houses received from the State Department a report on U. S. contributions to international organizations for the fiscal year 1959. pp. 12043, 12175

HOUSE - JUNE 17

9. FARM PROGRAM. The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of H. R. 12261, the Poage farm bill to modify market adjustment and price support programs for wheat and feed grains and to provide a high-protein food distribution program. p. 12159
10. MUTUAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. By a vote of 258 to 154, passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 12619. pp. 12102-59, 12170-1

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

JUNE 17, 1960.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 11776]

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, report the same to the Senate with various amendments and present herewith information relative to the changes made.

Amount of bill as passed House.....	\$8, 182, 067, 400
-------------------------------------	--------------------

Amount of increase by Senate.....	232, 345, 500
-----------------------------------	---------------

Amount of bill as reported to Senate.....	8, 414, 412, 900
---	------------------

Amount of appropriations, 1960.....	7, 165, 905, 700
-------------------------------------	------------------

Amount of regular and supplemental estimates, 1961.....	8, 417, 397, 000
--	------------------

The bill as reported to the Senate:

Under the estimates for 1961.....	2, 984, 100
-----------------------------------	-------------

Over the appropriations for 1960.....	1, 248, 507, 200
---------------------------------------	------------------

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill provides a total amount of \$8,414,412,900, which is \$2,984,100 under the estimates for 1961 and \$1,248,507,200 over the appropriations for 1960, and an increase of \$232,345,500 over the House bill.

Budget amendments were sent to the Senate (S. Doc. 106) as follows:

General Services Administration: Working capital fund-----	\$100, 000
Securities and Exchange Commission-----	400, 000

The House bill provided \$5 million over the budget estimates, for a pilot program on housing for the elderly, and \$1,531,000 for medical research for veterans.

The Senate committee has agreed with those increases and has added further increases over the budget estimates, as follows:

National Aeronautics and Space Administration: Research and development-----	\$50, 000, 000
Veterans' Administration: Medical research-----	9, 000, 000

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Restoration of \$500,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$25,200,000 for salaries and expenses, which is \$550,000 below the budget estimate. Authorization is also included for emergency and extraordinary expenses, as requested, in an amount not to exceed \$6,000. The committee recommends authorization for contracts for four consultants, instead of the eight requested, that may be renewed annually, of which one may provide for a \$75 per diem for a telecommunications expert.

The committee recommends deletion of the language earmarking \$185,000 for the Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Committee. The committee is advised it is no longer necessary under the reorganization of OCDM.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

The committee agrees with the House in providing for this purpose the same amount of \$6,250,000 as was appropriated last year, which is \$3,750,000 below the budget estimate, including enlargements of the programs. The committee believes that many of these proposed projects cover information that should be furnished by the agencies in the course of their regular operations.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The committee recommends restoration of \$12 million, with funds in that amount to be available for allocation to the States pursuant to section 205 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended. This will begin the program of matching grants for personnel and administrative expenses of State and local civil defense organizations authorized in Public Law 85-606. It is the view of the committee that such coordination is the heart of the civil defense organization and will materially increase the effectiveness of the entire program.

With the \$10 million allowed by the House for continuing the matching programs for equipment, training, and related purposes, the total amount provided for Federal contributions is \$22 million, which is the budget estimate.

The committee further recommends a proviso to ratify expenditures heretofore made in reliance upon a certification of obligations incurred or expenditures made prior to the availability of the appropriation.

The committee believes that the results of the auditing of the State programs which are now available show the need for the provision in order to continue an effective program.

EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Restoration of \$4,450,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of \$11,400,000 to cover chemical, biological, and radiological defense equipment, as well as stockpile management.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The committee agrees with the House in providing \$4 million for research and development, which is \$3,200,000 below the budget estimate; also, in limiting the fallout shelter prototype construction to \$2,500,000 to complete the 2-year program.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The committee recommends restoration of \$215,000, to provide a total amount of \$7,500,000 for salaries and expenses, which is \$100,000 below the budget estimate.

Last year the committee questioned whether the Board is making efficient use of its personnel and directed the Board to concentrate on its main responsibilities—route cases, accident investigation, rate matters, and proper enforcement of its economic regulations. This year the record shows that the Board has not assumed its statutory duty to investigate small plane accidents, is seeking substantial increases for peripheral activities such as carrier relations, which the Board has renamed "Special authorities" under the 1961 budget presentation, and has not made significant progress in overcoming work backlogs. The committee believes that the Board should assume its statutory duty to investigate small plane accidents. The committee further believes that the Board should eliminate peripheral activities as typified by many of the carrier relations functions, and directs that none of the funds herein provided be allocated to enlarge this activity.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

(Liquidation of contract authorization)

Restoration of \$8,984,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of \$68,984,000 for payments to air carriers.

The committee continues to be concerned over the level of payments to air carriers; \$68,984,000 is provided for payments to air carriers for fiscal 1961 and the Board has testified that over \$81 million in carrier payments may in fact accrue.

The committee urges the Board to exert every effort to reverse the trend of increased subsidy. Where feasible, the Board should expedite suspension of trunkline carriers in local service-type markets, freeing the local service carriers from trunk competition, and should insert local service carriers into markets which would be profitable for them but which trunk carriers seek to abandon. To the extent possible, the Board should avoid duplication between subsidized local

service carriers; also, to keep to a minimum those local service routes that cannot possibly be made to pay.

The committee believes that a most important contribution to reducing subsidy would be for the Board to permit local service carriers greater flexibility in operations in their assigned markets, permitting them to adjust their operations more freely to traffic volume.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The committee recommends restoration of \$350,000, to provide a total amount of \$19,580,000 for salaries and expenses, which is \$450,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee agrees with the House in denying \$30,000 for printing the Official Register, and recommends language to repeal the law requiring the Commission to issue this publication.

Complaints have been received from several agencies as to the effect of including "committees of expert examiners and boards of civil service examiners" in the listing of employees engaged in personnel work for the purposes of section 302 of the General Provisions, and the committee recommends the deletion of that language.

During the hearings, the committee questioned the Commission as to complaints that they had interpreted a prohibition in the 1957 Appropriations Act as preventing the continuation of the age factor as a criteria in selecting post office inspectors. While appreciating that there are many problems involved, the committee believes that the 1957 general provision clearly states "maximum age for entrance into positions in the competitive civil service" and the House report states:

The proviso has no other effect than to state that restrictions on employment by the Government based solely on age shall not be effective, but that other more reasonable standards shall be the governing consideration—

without any mention of promotion within the service. If this is not sufficient, the committee requests further consideration of the problems by the legislative committees.

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

As required by law, the Civil Service Commission submitted an estimate for 1961 of the amount of appropriations required on a normal-cost-plus-interest basis, in the amount of \$944,435,000, which was denied by the Bureau of the Budget. Such amount is not met by contributions of the agencies, and other than these agency appropriations no payment has been made for this purpose since 1957. The unfunded liability in the fund as of June 30, 1959, was over \$28 billion.

The bill does include a payment of \$46,329,000, solely to cover the increased cost of the temporary increase in annuity provided in 1958.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

EXPENSES

The committee recommends restoration of \$15,638,000, to provide a total amount for expenses of \$380,883,000, which is \$2,117,000 below

the budget estimate. The committee has specifically denied the amount of \$117,000 for the training of civil air attachés, in line with the action of the House. The committee is advised that, without this restoration, many of the essential facilities scheduled for operation in 1961 could not be manned.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

Restoration is recommended by the committee of \$21,500,000, to provide the full budget estimate of \$174 million for establishment of air navigation facilities. The committee is advised that the requirements of military and civil aviation will need the full amount of the budget estimate, particularly in view of the budget amendment which had earlier reduced the estimate by \$21 million. The committee further recommends authorization to purchase two additional aircraft, for a total of seven.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

During the hearings on the bill, the Commission requested \$300,000 to establish a new and separate Complaints and Compliance Division in the Broadcast Bureau, which had been set up by the Commission as of June 1 and had not been considered by the House. Of this amount, \$210,000 was requested for personnel services, \$42,000 for travel, and \$48,000 for monitoring service and other expenditures. The committee was advised that such extended investigations of complaints would include hearings in the field, and it is the feeling of the committee that such procedure might lead to considerations of program material and get into the realm of censorship, which is prohibited by law.

Accordingly, the committee recommends restoration of \$200,000 to provide a total amount of \$13,135,000, which is \$365,000 below the budget estimate, as well as an increase in travel limitation of \$28,000 to provide a total of \$172,000. This restoration is for the purpose of enlarging the activity of investigations of stations as to technical and legal requirements, and the committee directs that in no way are such funds to be utilized in any function remotely approaching censorship.

The committee agrees with the House in providing \$2 million for a comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of ultra-high-frequency television transmission and reception, and urges that television broadcasters and other industry representatives be kept thoroughly familiar with the planning and conduct of the study, with sufficient opportunity to participate therein, in order that the Commission may have the benefit of the accumulated knowledge and experience of industry in this field.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

The committee recommends restoration of \$200,000, to provide a total amount of \$8,341,000 for examination expenses, which is \$196,000 below the budget estimate.

For the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the committee recommends restoration of \$12,500, to provide the full budget estimate of \$800,000 for administrative expenses. The committee further recommends deletion of the proviso limiting nonadministrative obligations of the Corporation to \$887,800, since the committee is advised such limitation would prevent the Corporation

from paying insurance claims and other expenses necessary to fulfill the insurance contract.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Restoration is recommended by the committee of \$263,000, to provide the full budget estimate of \$7,795,000 for salaries and expenses.

The committee further recommends language to provide the Commission with six new supergrades, four in GS-18, one in GS-17, and one in GS-16. The committee is of the opinion that in availing itself of these additional supergrades the Commission should obtain the best informed and most able employees it can recruit. It is the intention of the committee that these new grades are not solely allowed for the purpose of increasing salaries.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The committee recommends restoration of \$185,000, to provide the full amount of the budget estimate of \$7,600,000. The committee believes that the allocation of positions should be left to the discretion of the Commission, in order to assure effective use of personnel and economical administration. The Commission has increased its work in keeping with its responsibility to protect the buying public. They need these funds to continue this work unhampered.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

The committee recommends restoration of \$8,450,000, to provide a total amount of \$169,300,000 for operating expenses, which is \$1,200,000 below the budget estimate. The committee is advised that the restoration is required for continuation of wage board increases, for operation and maintenance in new buildings, and for the cost of new and expanded lease space.

REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

The committee agrees with the action of the House in providing \$58 million, which is \$2 million below the budget estimate.

In this connection, the committee is advised that GSA has traditionally financed repair and improvement of Public Health Service hospitals and similar facilities such as the National Institutes of Health at Bethesda, Md., from the former appropriation "Repair and improvement of federally owned buildings," and provisions were made for continuing the financing of such work under the present title for 1961. A question has arisen as to whether such facilities are covered as public buildings under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, or would require a Presidential designation. Meantime, the committee agrees that GSA should continue to finance such costs under this appropriation, until the question is resolved.

CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

To the amount stated in the House bill of \$144,836,000, the committee recommends the addition of \$27,144,000, to provide a total amount of \$171,980,000 for construction of public buildings projects.

General Services Administration, based upon current bids, has accepted the reductions made in the House bill for maximum construction improvement costs at the projects listed. They requested additional sums for most of the projects, amounting to \$11,132,000, in order to include fallout shelters in these new buildings, in line with the national shelter policy. At the request of the committee, they have refigured these additional amounts in order to postpone the built-in mechanical equipment involved, totaling \$4,652,000, and to include only such basic fallout protection as construction of increased thickness of slabs, walls, and underground extension, at a total cost of \$6,480,000.

The committee has restored FOB No. 9, FOB No. 10, and the U.S. Court of Claims and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals Buildings in the District of Columbia that were deleted in the House on a point of order as to authorization, which has since been accomplished, and has added FOB No. 8 under a revised estimate.

Construction projects in the bill

	Budget estimate	Limit of cost in House bill	Senate additions for construction of increased thickness of slabs, walls, and underground extension	Limit of cost in Senate bill	Built-in mechanical equipment costs (not provided at this time)
Camden, Ark.....	\$775,250	\$633,250	\$21,800	\$655,050	\$28,600
San Francisco, Calif.....	41,509,100	37,286,100	1,010,800	38,296,900	700,000
Hartford, Conn.....	8,835,400	7,636,400	180,000	7,816,400	135,000
Miami, Fla.....	7,683,250	7,076,250		7,076,250	
Thomasville, Ga.....	1,201,000	1,094,000	25,600	1,119,600	32,000
Jackman, Maine.....	323,850	289,850		289,850	
Van Buren, Maine.....	403,750	284,750	12,800	297,550	25,000
Vanceboro, Maine.....	303,150	254,150	7,000	261,150	11,000
Detroit, Mich.....	957,650	874,650	20,400	895,050	30,000
Sweetgrass, Mont.....	944,500	586,500	29,100	615,600	33,000
Albuquerque, N. Mex.....	519,200	469,200		469,200	
Blismarek, N. Dak.....	3,831,050	3,224,050	59,000	3,283,050	40,000
Toledo, Ohio.....	4,756,700	3,867,700	113,000	3,980,700	85,000
Philadelphia, Pa.....	5,825,500	5,601,500		5,601,500	
Memphis, Tenn.....	11,481,150	9,587,150	580,000	10,167,150	410,000
El Paso, Tex.....	1,155,700	1,055,700		1,055,700	
Dayton, Wash.....	312,200	282,200	6,500	288,700	12,400
District of Columbia:					
Federal Office Bldg. No. 8.....	16,244,000		630,000	15,794,000	450,000
Federal Office Bldg. No. 9.....	22,790,100	20,031,100	1,191,000	21,222,100	780,000
Federal Office Bldg. No. 10.....	42,223,500	38,326,500	2,477,000	40,803,500	1,780,000
Court of Claims.....	6,835,000	6,375,000	116,000	6,491,000	100,000
Chicago, Ill.....		(1)		5,500,000	
Total.....	178,911,000	144,836,000	6,480,000	171,980,000	4,652,000

Under "Sites and expenses."

In order to limit these funds to authorized projects, the committee recommends language to make the available amounts subject to approval of the Public Works Committees.

The proviso allowing \$5,500,000 for clearing the site and installing footings for the Chicago project is recommended to be transferred to the construction item from the sites and expenses item.

SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

The committee recommends a reduction of \$5,500,000, to provide a total amount of \$19,500,000 for sites and expenses. This reduction is in line with the recommendation to transfer the proviso as to the Chicago project to the construction item.

Language is recommended by the committee to allow the preparation of plans and specifications to proceed as to FOB No. 7 in the District of Columbia, without provision of space for the U.S. Court of Claims in that location.

During hearings on the bill the committee ascertained that no funds were specifically included for acquisition of sites and design of six buildings for which prospectuses were approved by the Public Works Committee of the Senate on April 29, 1960, and by the House Committee on May 17, 1960.

The projects are for a post office and Federal office building at Winder, Ga.; a post office and courthouse and a quarantine station and clinic both at Honolulu, Hawaii; a post office and courthouse at Albuquerque, N. Mex.; a courthouse and Federal office building at Cleveland, Ohio; and a Federal office building at Pierre, S. Dak. These projects require \$9,208,000 for sites and expenses to which \$5,218,000 now in the bill can be applied, leaving a shortage of \$3,990,000. The shortage can be overcome by use of funds previously appropriated, but unobligated, for site and design costs incident to the proposed FOB No. 5 and Geological Survey buildings in the District of Columbia area, neither of which have been approved by the Committees on Public Works of the House and Senate. Without such approval the funds cannot be utilized for these two buildings.

The committee, accordingly, authorizes the Administrator to utilize such funds to complete the funding of site and expense costs incident to the six approved projects enumerated above.

CONSTRUCTION OF RELOCATION FACILITIES

The committee recommends inserting in the bill the item for "Construction of relocation facilities" at the budget estimate of \$3,800,000 for the first of 11 such facilities around Washington, D.C.

FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

Restoration is recommended by the committee of \$523,500, to provide the full budget estimate of \$4,240,000 for operating expenses.

TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC UTILITIES SERVICE

The committee agrees with the House in providing \$2,375,000 for this service, which is \$25,000 below the budget estimate.

The committee has noted with concern the constant increase in budget requests of the transportation and public utilities services of the General Services Administration. This increased budget, along with allegations that this work duplicates that of the regulatory agencies, concerns the committee. Accordingly, the committee looks to the General Services Administration to carefully reappraise this function and the committee will plan to explore the matter more fully between now and the next budget period.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

The committee is advised that the \$30 million provided by the House, together with unobligated balances of funds previously appropriated, will be sufficient to provide for the total obligational program of \$43,100,000, including upgrading of stockpiled materials, and the

committee concurs with the use of the unobligated balances for this purpose.

The committee recommends including language to allow transfers of materials without limitation as to value where the objectives of the stockpile have not been met.

The committee further recommends striking the words "or otherwise" in the proviso requiring receipts from sales to be deposited into the Treasury, in order to permit reimbursements for services under the Economy Act.

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

The committee recommends inserting in the bill a new item for working capital fund in the amount of \$100,000; as requested in Senate Document No. 106, to provide capital to finance the establishment and operation of additional field printing plants as authorized by the Joint Committee on Printing.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

Restoration of \$300,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of \$13,300,000. The committee is advised that the restoration is required by the transfers of additional functions.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

In the provision making construction funds available, the committee recommends deleting the words "extension and conversion" from the designation of approved projects outside the District of Columbia.

The committee further recommends adding provisions for requiring authorization for buildings constructed for corporations, and for allowing time for local governmental units to perfect a coordinated plan of use in surplus property disposition.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY

The committee agrees with the House in providing \$5 million to initiate a pilot program in the area of critical need for housing for the elderly, for which there was no budget estimate.

COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

Restoration of \$140,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of \$1,400,000 for administrative expenses of this loan program.

PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

The committee recommends restoration of \$53,000, to provide the full budget estimate of \$530,000 for administrative expenses of this loan program.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Restoration of \$200,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of \$8,650,000 for the administrative expense limitation.

The committee further recommends, as to nonadministrative expenses, substituting a proviso limiting such expenses to \$50 million, with 15 percent in addition to process necessary workloads. The committee is advised that the handicaps of the House language would restrict mortgage operations.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The committee recommends restoration of \$723,000, to provide the full budget estimate of \$20,500,000 for salaries and expenses. The committee is advised that the restoration is required in order to perform duties under new legislation as well as to prevent increasing the backlog of the workload.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

Restoration of \$4,260,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of \$170,760,000 for salaries and expenses. The committee further recommends increasing the travel limitation by \$949,000, to provide the budget estimate of \$5,849,000.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

NASA officials have testified that no provision was made in the budget estimates for contingencies, cost increases, or unplanned program modifications, despite the fact that the short history of the space program has been characterized by gross underestimates of the costs. For example, in February 1959, the total cost of Project Mercury was officially estimated at \$250 million and the 1960 budget was prepared on this basis. By December 1959, the cost estimate was increased to \$350 million. This is an increase of \$150 million in less than 1 year.

Similarly, Dr. Glennan testified that in fiscal year 1960 there had been major cost overruns on Tiros I and its booster, on the development of the nuclear emulsion recovery capsule (NERV) and on the Pioneer V and Explorer satellites. He stated that:

These unforeseen cost increases have had to be covered at the expense of other programs since no contingency funds were provided. Some of these programs have been reduced in scope, others deferred as we robbed them to get on with the more immediate tasks.

At the hearings, the committee was advised that NASA has already identified more than \$20 million of additional costs not covered by the fiscal year 1961 budget request. The Congress has authorized appropriation of an additional \$50 million for research and development in order to assure that neither the space program nor the safety of personnel is jeopardized by lack of funds. The committee recommends providing the full amount authorized by the Congress, and has therefore added \$69,213,000 to the amount approved by the House, for a total research and development appropriation of \$671,453,000.

The committee further recommends that the authorization for the purchase of passenger motor vehicles be increased from 45 to 60.

CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

The committee recommends restoration of \$15,512,000, to provide the full budget estimate of \$122,787,000 for construction and equipment.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The committee recommends adding a provision allowing \$20,000 for scientific consultations and emergency or extraordinary expense, as authorized.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

The committee recommends deleting this item from the bill, in the amount of \$40,000, thus permitting the Authority to operate as provided under the Housing Act of 1950, with budgets approved by the Public Housing Administration.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

The committee recommends adding \$31,600,000 to the House amount, to provide the total budget estimate of \$191,600,000 for salaries and expenses and for purchase of foreign currencies. The committee believes that proper support of basic research and scientific manpower require the full amount estimated.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The committee considered a request for an increase of \$400,000 contained in Senate Document No. 106, to provide for handling additional workload in the full disclosure, investigations, and investment company programs. The committee was also advised of the urgent need for restoring the amount of \$375,000. The committee recommends adding \$775,000 to the House allowance, to provide a total amount of \$9,300,000, the revised estimate. The committee also believes the allocation of the positions should be left to the discretion of the Commission, in order to achieve maximum efficiency at a minimum cost.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Restoration of \$2,500,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide a total amount of \$32,778,400, which is \$171,600 below the budget estimate.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

The committee heard distinguished doctors support additional medical research in the fields of cancer, heart disease, mental illness, aging, tuberculosis, neurology, and other cooperative studies. The committee believes that previous additional funds that have been provided have been well utilized, with many benefits. Accordingly, the committee recommends adding \$9 million to the House allowance, to provide a total amount of \$39 million for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses, as well as adding \$9 million to the earmarking for medical research, to provide a total amount of \$26 million.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitations on amounts of corporate funds to be expended]

Corporation or agency	Authoriza- tion, 1960	Budget esti- mates, 1961	Recommended in House bill for 1961	Amount recommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—		
					Authoriza- tions, 1960	Budget esti- mates, 1961	House bill
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	(\$1,800,000)	(\$2,075,000)	(\$1,943,000)	(\$1,943,000)	(+\$143,000)	(-\$132,000)	-----
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.....	(775,000)	(800,000)	(787,500)	(800,000)	(+25,000)	-----	(+\$12,500)
General Services Administration:							
Abaca fiber program.....	(47,000)	-----	-----	-----	(-47,000)	-----	-----
Federal Facilities Corporation.....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	-----	-----	-----
Reconstruction Finance Corporation liquidation fund.....	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	-----	-----	-----
Housing and Home Finance Agency:							
College housing loans.....	(1,723,000)	(1,400,000)	(1,220,000)	(1,400,000)	(-323,000)	-----	(+140,000)
Public facility loans.....	(525,000)	(530,000)	(477,000)	(530,000)	(+5,000)	-----	(+53,000)
Revolving fund (liquidating programs).....	(653,000)	(155,000)	(139,500)	(139,500)	(-513,500)	(-15,500)	-----
Federal National Mortgage Association.....	(6,150,000)	(6,650,000)	(6,550,000)	(6,550,000)	(+400,000)	(-100,000)	-----
Federal Housing Administration.....	(8,100,000)	(8,800,000)	(8,450,000)	(8,650,000)	(+550,000)	(-150,000)	(+200,000)
Public Housing Administration.....	(12,830,000)	(13,200,000)	(13,050,000)	(13,050,000)	(+220,000)	(-150,000)	-----
Total, administrative expenses.....	(32,663,000)	(33,670,000)	(32,717,000)	(33,122,500)	(+459,500)	(-647,500)	(+403,500)

PERMANENT AND INDEFINITE ANNUAL APPROPRIATIONS

Object	Appropriations, 1960	Budget estimates, 1961	Increase (+) or decrease (-), estimates compared with appropriations
Federal Power Commission: Payments to States under Federal Power Act.....	\$57,000	\$61,000	+\$4,000
General Services Administration: Expenses, disposal of surplus real and related personal property.....	1,400,000	2,000,000	+600,000
Total, permanent and indefinite appropriations.....	1,457,000	2,061,000	+604,000

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR 1960 AND ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS RECOMMENDED
IN BILL FOR 1961**

Item	Appropriations, 1960 ¹	Budget esti- mates, 1961	Recommended in House bill for 1961	Amount rec- ommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1960	Budget esti- mates, 1961	House bill
TITLE I							
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT							
OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION							
Salaries and expenses.....	\$29,535,000	\$25,750,000	\$24,700,000	\$25,200,000	—\$4,335,000	—\$550,000	+ \$500,000
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.....		10,000,000	6,250,000	6,250,000	+6,250,000	—3,750,000	-----
Federal contributions.....	10,000,000	22,000,000	10,000,000	22,000,000	+12,000,000	-----	+12,000,000
Emergency supplies and equipment.....	6,950,000	11,400,000	6,950,000	11,400,000	+4,450,000	-----	+4,450,000
Research and development.....	4,000,000	7,200,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-----	—3,200,000	-----
Construction of facilities.....	2,400,000				—2,400,000	-----	-----
Total, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.....	52,885,000	76,350,000	51,900,000	68,850,000	+15,965,000	—7,500,000	+16,950,000
INDEPENDENT OFFICES							
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD							
Salaries and expenses.....	6,925,000	7,600,000	7,285,000	7,500,000	+575,000	—100,000	+215,000
Payments to air carriers (liquidation of contract authorization).....	58,500,000	68,984,000	60,000,000	68,984,000	+10,384,000	-----	+8,984,000
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board.....	65,425,000	76,584,000	67,285,000	76,484,000	+11,059,000	—100,000	+9,199,000
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION							
Salaries and expenses.....	19,120,000	20,030,000	19,230,000	19,580,000	+460,000	-----	+350,000
Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations.....	400,000	467,000	400,000	400,000	-----	—67,000	-----
Annuities under special acts.....	2,450,000	2,316,000	2,316,000	2,316,000	—134,000	-----	-----

Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund-----		2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	+2,500,000	-----
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund-----		46,329,000	46,329,000	46,329,000	+46,329,000	-----
Administrative expenses, Employees' Life Insurance Fund (limitation)-----	(249,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(+1,000)	-----
Total, Civil Service Commission-----	21,970,000	71,642,000	70,775,000	71,125,000	+49,155,000	+350,000
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY						
Expenses-----	318,700,000	383,000,000	365,245,000	380,883,000	+62,183,000	+15,638,000
Establishment of air navigation facilities-----	118,200,000	2 174,000,000	152,500,000	174,000,000	+55,800,000	+21,500,000
Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization)-----	57,500,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	+22,500,000	-----
Research and development-----	48,725,000	65,000,000	64,000,000	64,000,000	+15,275,000	-----
Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports-----		6,000,000			-1,000,000	-----
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport-----	2,400,000		3,230,000	3,230,000	+3,230,000	-----
Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport-----			2,450,000	2,450,000	+2,450,000	-----
Construction, Washington National Airport-----		5,000,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	+4,500,000	-----
Construction and development, additional Washington Airport-----	22,470,000				-22,470,000	-----
Total, Federal Aviation Agency-----	567,995,000	713,000,000	671,925,000	709,063,000	+141,068,000	+37,138,000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION						
Salaries and expenses-----	10,550,000	13,500,000	12,935,000	13,135,000	+2,585,000	+200,000
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION						
Salaries and expenses-----	7,218,000	7,795,000	7,532,000	7,795,000	+577,000	+263,000
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION						
Salaries and expenses-----	6,840,000	7,600,000	7,415,000	7,600,000	+760,000	+185,000
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE						
Salaries and expenses-----	41,800,000	41,150,000	41,150,000	41,150,000	-650,000	-----

See footnotes at end of table, p. 19.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1960 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1961—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1960 ¹	Budget esti- mates, 1961	Recommended in House bill for 1961	Amount rec- ommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with—		
					Appropriations, 1960	Budget esti- mates, 1961	House bill
TITLE I—Continued							
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued							
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION							
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service.....	\$154,530,000	\$170,500,000	\$160,850,000	\$169,300,000	+\$14,710,000	-\$1,200,000	+\$8,450,000
Repair and improvements of public buildings.....	60,000,000	60,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000	-2,000,000	-2,000,000	-----
Construction and acquisition of public buildings.....	-----	185,000,000	-----	-----	-----	-185,000,000	-----
Construction, public buildings projects.....	-----	-----	144,836,000	171,980,000	+171,980,000	+171,980,000	+27,144,000
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects.....	25,000,000	-----	25,000,000	19,500,000	-5,500,000	+19,500,000	-5,500,000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts.....	1,675,000	4,630,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	+2,325,000	-630,000	-----
Construction of relocation facilities.....	-----	3,800,000	-----	3,800,000	+3,800,000	-----	+3,800,000
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service.....	3,770,000	4,240,000	3,716,500	4,240,000	+470,000	-----	+523,500
<i>Indefinite appropriation of receipts</i>	<i>(2,230,000)</i>	<i>(2,260,000)</i>	<i>(2,242,500)</i>	<i>(2,242,500)</i>	<i>(+12,500)</i>	<i>(-16,500)</i>	-----
Expenses, supply distribution.....	21,450,000	23,300,000	22,950,000	22,950,000	+1,500,000	-350,000	-----
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service.....	9,176,800	9,600,000	9,420,000	9,420,000	+243,200	-180,000	-----
Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service.....	2,000,000	2,400,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	+375,000	-25,000	-----
Strategic and critical materials.....	-----	39,132,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	+30,000,000	-9,132,000	-----
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator.....	225,000	240,000	240,000	240,000	+15,000	-----	-----
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents.....	200,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	+50,000	-----	-----
Refunds under Renegotiation Act.....	-----	900,000	900,000	900,000	+900,000	-----	-----
Working capital fund.....	-----	\$ 100,000	-----	100,000	+100,000	-----	+100,000

	(12, 750, 000)	(13, 300, 000)	(15, 000, 000)	(15, 300, 000)	(+ 550, 000)	(+ 300, 000)
Administrative operations funds (limitation)-----						
Total, General Services Administration-----	278, 086, 800	504, 092, 000	462, 537, 500	497, 055, 000	+218, 968, 200	+34, 517, 500
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY						
Office of the Administrator:						
Salaries and expenses-----	9, 342, 000	10, 637, 000	10, 327, 000	10, 327, 000	+985, 000	-310, 000
Urban planning grants-----	3, 375, 000	4, 750, 000	4, 000, 000	4, 000, 000	+625, 000	-750, 000
Reserve of planned public works (payment to revolving fund)-----	6, 000, 000	7, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	6, 000, 000	-----	-1, 000, 000
Grants for slum clearance and urban renewal-----	107, 500, 000	150, 000, 000	150, 000, 000	150, 000, 000	+42, 500, 000	-----
Housing for the elderly (payment to revolving fund)-----	-----	-----	5, 000, 000	5, 000, 000	+5, 000, 000	+5, 000, 000
Housing studies (liquidation of contract authorization)-----	-----	600, 000	-----	-----	-----	-600, 000
Total, Office of the Administrator-----	126, 217, 000	172, 987, 000	175, 327, 000	175, 327, 000	+49, 110, 000	+2, 340, 000
Public Housing Administration:						
Annual contributions-----	120, 000, 000	146, 000, 000	140, 000, 000	140, 000, 000	+20, 000, 000	-6, 000, 000
Administrative expenses-----	12, 830, 000	13, 200, 000	13, 050, 000	13, 050, 000	+220, 000	-150, 000
Total, Public Housing Administration-----	132, 830, 000	159, 200, 000	153, 050, 000	153, 050, 000	+20, 220, 000	-6, 150, 000
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency-----	259, 047, 000	332, 187, 000	328, 377, 000	328, 377, 000	+69, 330, 000	-3, 810, 000
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION						
Salaries and expenses-----	19, 650, 000	20, 500, 000	19, 777, 000	20, 500, 000	+850, 000	+723, 000
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION						
Salaries and expenses-----	91, 400, 000	3 170, 760, 000	166, 500, 000	170, 760, 000	+79, 360, 000	+4, 260, 000
Research and development-----	330, 875, 000	4 621, 453, 000	602, 240, 000	671, 453, 000	+340, 578, 000	+69, 213, 000
Construction and equipment-----	62, 800, 000	5 122, 787, 000	107, 275, 000	122, 787, 000	+59, 987, 000	+15, 512, 000
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration-----	485, 075, 000	915, 000, 000	876, 015, 000	965, 000, 000	+479, 925, 000	+88, 985, 000
NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY						
Operation and maintenance of properties-----	40, 000	41, 000	40, 000	-----	-40, 000	-40, 000

See footnotes at end of table, p. 19.

Comparative statement of appropriations for 1960 and estimates and amounts recommended in bill for 1961—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1960 ¹	Budget esti- mates, 1961	Recommended in House bill for 1961	Amount rec- ommended by Senate committee	Increase (+) or decrease (-), Senate bill compared with--	
					Appropriations, 1960	Budget esti- mates, 1961
TITLE I--Continued						
INDEPENDENT OFFICES--Continued						
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION						
Salaries and expenses.....	\$ 152, 773, 000	\$190, 000, 000	\$163, 000, 000	\$191, 600, 000	+\$38, 827, 000	+\$31, 600, 000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program).....		1, 600, 000				
Total, National Science Foundation.....	152, 773, 000	191, 600, 000	160, 000, 000	191, 600, 000	+38, 827, 000	+31, 600, 000
RENEGOTIATION BOARD						
Salaries and expenses.....	2, 850, 000	2, 870, 000	2, 870, 000	2, 870, 000	+20, 000	
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION						
Salaries and expenses.....	8, 100, 000	9, 300, 000	8, 525, 000	9, 300, 000	+1, 200, 000	+775, 000
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM						
Salaries and expenses.....	29, 278, 400	32, 950, 000	30, 278, 400	32, 778, 400	+3, 500, 000	+2, 500, 000
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION						
General operating expenses.....	165, 373, 000	153, 500, 000	153, 500, 000	153, 500, 000	-11, 873, 000	
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	29, 349, 000	28, 469, 000	30, 000, 000	39, 000, 000	+9, 651, 000	+9, 000, 000
Inpatient care.....	800, 889, 000	817, 021, 000	817, 021, 000	817, 021, 000	+16, 132, 000	
Outpatient care.....	83, 866, 000	86, 481, 000	86, 481, 000	86, 481, 000	+2, 615, 000	
Maintenance and operation of supply depots.....	2, 266, 500	2, 520, 000	2, 500, 000	2, 500, 000	+233, 500	-20, 000
Compensation and pensions.....	3, 400, 000, 000	3, 840, 000, 000	3, 800, 000, 000	3, 800, 000, 000	+400, 000, 000	-40, 000, 000
Readjustment benefits.....	585, 000, 000	7344, 000, 000	344, 000, 000	344, 000, 000	-241, 000, 000	

Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	53,000,000	48,800,000	48,800,000	-4,200,000	-----
<i>Indefinite appropriation of receipts</i>	(590,000)	(685,000)	(685,000)	(-5,000)	-----
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	2,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	-500,000	-----
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.....	31,659,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	+43,341,000	-----
Total, Veterans' Administration.....	5,153,402,500	5,358,802,000	5,367,802,000	+214,399,500	+9,000,000
Total definite appropriations.....	7,162,985,700	8,178,138,900	8,410,484,400	+1,247,498,700	+232,345,500
Total, indefinite appropriations.....	2,920,000	3,945,000	3,928,500	+1,008,500	-----
Total, title I.....	7,165,905,700	8,417,397,000	8,414,412,900	+1,248,507,200	+232,345,500

- ¹ Includes 1960 amounts in Public Laws 86-213, 86-383, 86-424, and 86-425.
² Estimate decreased \$21,000,000 in H. Doc. 371.
³ Includes \$3,200,000 contained in H. Doc. 329.
⁴ Includes \$76,300,000 contained in H. Doc. 329.
⁵ Includes \$33,500,000 contained in H. Doc. 329.
⁶ Estimate decreased \$554,000 in H. Doc. 328.
⁷ Estimate decreased \$66,000,000 in H. Doc. 328.
⁸ Contained in S. Doc. 106.
⁹ Includes \$400,000 contained in S. Doc. 106.

Calendar No. 1674

86TH CONGRESS
2^D SESSION

H. R. 11776

[Report No. 1611]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

APRIL 21, 1960

Read twice and referred to the Committee on Appropriations

JUNE 17, 1960

Reported by Mr. MAGNUSON, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry
5 independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, cor-
6 porations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending
7 June 30, 1961, namely:

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE

MOBILIZATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; *not to exceed \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and not to exceed \$900,000 for expenses of travel; \$24,700,000 \$25,200,000, of which \$185,000 shall be available for the Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Committee: Provided, That one contract for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), for not to exceed one person, may be renewed annually at a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75: Provided, That contracts for not to exceed four persons under this appropriation for temporary or intermittent services as author-*

1 *ized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C.*
 2 *55a), may be renewed annually, and one such contract, for*
 3 *the services of an expert or consultant for telecommunications,*
 4 *may provide for a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75.*

5 CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS
 6 OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

7 For expenses necessary to enable other Federal agencies
 8 to perform such civil defense and defense mobilization func-
 9 tions as may be designated by the Office of Civil and Defense
 10 Mobilization, including payments by the Department of
 11 Labor to State employment security agencies for the full cost
 12 of administration of defense manpower mobilization activi-
 13 ties, \$6,250,000.

14 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

15 For financial contributions to the States for civil defense
 16 purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,
 17 as amended, to be equally matched with State funds,
 18 ~~\$10,000,000~~ \$22,000,000, of which none shall be allocated
 19 to the States pursuant to section 205 of said Act of which
 20 not to exceed \$12,000,000 shall be available for allocation
 21 to the States pursuant to section 205 of said Act: Provided,
 22 That expenditures heretofore made under this appropriation
 23 head in reliance upon a certification of the appropriate State
 24 official for obligations incurred or expenditures made by a

1 *State or subdivision thereof prior to the availability of the*
2 *applicable Federal appropriation are hereby ratified and*
3 *confirmed if otherwise proper.*

4 EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

5 For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing,
6 distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense
7 materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of
8 the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended,
9 ~~\$6,950,000~~ \$11,400,000.

10 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

11 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
12 studies and research to develop measures and plans for
13 evacuation, shelter, and the protection of life and property,
14 as authorized by section 201 (d) of the Federal Civil Defense
15 Act of 1950, as amended, including services as authorized
16 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
17 \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which
18 not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available to complete the
19 two-year program of fallout shelter prototype construction.

20 No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be avail-
21 able for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of
22 warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed
23 specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense
24 Mobilization.

1 INDEPENDENT OFFICES

2 CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board,
5 including contract stenographic reporting services; employ-
6 ment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; hire,
7 operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; purchase
8 (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor
9 vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
10 of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals
11 not to exceed \$50 per diem; ~~\$7,285,000~~ \$7,500,000.

12 PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT
13 AUTHORIZATION)

14 For payments to air carriers of so much of the compen-
15 sation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board
16 under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958
17 (49 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, ~~\$60,000,000,~~
18 \$68,984,000, to remain available until expended.

19 CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$22,-
22 000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
23 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed \$10,000
24 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private

1 physicians on a fee basis; payment in advance for library
2 membership in societies whose publications are available to
3 members only or to members at a price lower than to the
4 general public; not to exceed \$77,000 for performing the
5 duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19,
6 1940 (54 Stat. 767) ; reimbursement of the General Services
7 Administration for security guard services for protection of
8 confidential files; and not to exceed \$5,000 for actuarial
9 services by contract, without regard to section 3709, Revised
10 Statutes, as amended; ~~\$19,230,000~~ \$19,580,000: *Provided,*
11 That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the
12 Career Executive Board established by Executive Order
13 10758 of March 4, 1958, as amended.

14 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
15 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and
16 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and
17 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established
18 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

19 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
20 Service Commission shall be available for printing the Official
21 Register of the United States, *and the Act of August 28,*
22 *1938 (49 Stat. 956), as amended by the Act of August 27,*
23 *1951 (65 Stat. 198), is hereby repealed.*

1 INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EM-
2 PLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

3 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
4 Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended,
5 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary
6 General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of
7 other international organizations, certain information con-
8 cerning United States citizens employed, or being considered
9 for employment by such organizations, including services as
10 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
11 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$400,000: *Provided*, That this appro-
12 priation shall be available for advances or reimbursements
13 to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil
14 Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation
15 for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive
16 order: *Provided further*, That members of the International
17 Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual
18 transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence
19 authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended,
20 while traveling on official business away from their homes
21 or regular places of business, including periods while en route
22 to and from and at the place where their services are to be
23 performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in sections 281

1 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of
2 the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed to apply
3 to any person because of appointment for part-time or in-
4 termittent service as a member of the International Organiza-
5 tions Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Commis-
6 sion as established by Executive Order 10422, dated January
7 9, 1953, as amended.

8 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

9 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May
10 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of
11 August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775),
12 \$2,316,000.

13 GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES

14 HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

15 For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund" of
16 Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as
17 authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health
18 Benefits Act (73 Stat. 713), \$2,500,000, to remain avail-
19 able until expended.

20 PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DIS-

21 ABILITY FUND

22 For financing the annuity benefits and increases, during
23 the current fiscal year, provided by the Act of June 25,
24 1958 (72 Stat. 218), \$46,329,000, to be credited to the
25 civil service retirement and disability fund.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES

2 LIFE INSURANCE FUND

3 Not to exceed \$250,000 of the funds in the "Em-
 4 ployees' Life Insurance Fund" shall be available for
 5 reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for ad-
 6 ministrative expenses incurred by the Commission during
 7 the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal
 8 Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended
 9 (5 U.S.C. 2091-2103): *Provided*, That this limitation
 10 shall include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act,
 11 notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law
 12 85-377 (5 U.S.C. 2094 (c)).

13 FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

14 EXPENSES

15 For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency,
 16 not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses
 17 for research and development and for establishment of air
 18 navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the
 19 Federal Airport Act; purchase of twenty passenger motor
 20 vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed \$5,000 for
 21 representation allowances and for official entertainment; and
 22 purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; ~~\$365,245,000~~
 23 \$380,883,000: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this
 24 appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipi-

1 palities, other public authorities, and private sources, for ex-
2 penses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air
3 navigation facilities.

4 ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

5 For an additional amount for the acquisition, establish-
6 ment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of
7 air navigation facilities, including the initial acquisition of
8 necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and fur-
9 nishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers
10 and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at
11 remote localities where such accommodations are not avail-
12 able (at a total cost of construction of not to exceed \$50,000
13 per housing unit in Alaska) ; purchase of ~~five~~ *seven* aircraft;
14 and the initial flight checking of air navigation facilities and
15 the transportation by air to and from and within Alaska and
16 the Territories of the United States of materials and equip-
17 ment secured under this appropriation; ~~\$152,500,000~~ \$174,-
18 000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That
19 there may be credited to this appropriation funds received
20 from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities,
21 and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establish-
22 ment of air navigation facilities.

1 GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF
2 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

3 For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority
4 granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to
5 enter into contracts, \$80,000,000, to remain available until
6 expended.

7 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

8 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
9 research, development, and service testing, including con-
10 struction of experimental facilities and acquisition of neces-
11 sary sites by lease or grant, \$64,000,000, to remain available
12 until expended.

13 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL
14 AIRPORT

15 (For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-
16 nance, improvement and protection of the Washington
17 National Airport, including purchase of one passenger motor
18 vehicle, for replacement only, for police-type use which may
19 exceed by \$300 the general purchase price limitation for
20 the current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of
21 uniforms; and arms and ammunition; \$3,230,000.

1 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES INTERNATIONAL
2 AIRPORT

3 For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-
4 nance, improvement and protection of the Dulles Interna-
5 tional Airport, including purchase of four passenger motor
6 vehicles, of which three for police-type use may exceed by
7 \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the
8 current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of uni-
9 forms; and arms and ammunition; \$2,450,000.

10 CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

11 For necessary expenses for construction at Washington
12 National Airport, including acquisition of land, \$4,500,000,
13 to remain available until expended.

14 GENERAL PROVISION

15 During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations
16 to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the
17 Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified
18 in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C.
19 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Admin-
20 istrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance and
21 operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and
22 aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized
23 by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C.
24 2131).

1 FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the
4 Commission as authorized by law, including land and struc-
5 tures (not to exceed \$23,000), special counsel fees, im-
6 provement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not
7 to exceed \$14,600), services as authorized by section 15 of
8 the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), *not to exceed*
9 *\$172,000 for expenses of travel*, and purchase of not to
10 exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only,
11 ~~\$12,935,000~~ *\$13,135,000: Provided, That not to exceed*
12 *\$2,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for a*
13 *special ultra-high frequency television study and shall remain*
14 *available until June 30, 1962.*

15 FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission,
18 as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor
19 vehicles, ~~\$7,532,000~~ *\$7,795,000*, of which not to exceed
20 \$10,000 shall be available for special counsel and services
21 as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
22 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not exceeding \$50 per diem
23 for individuals: *Provided, That the Commission is author-*
24 *ized, subject to the procedures prescribed in the Classifica-*

tion Act of 1949, as amended, but without regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, to place six General Schedule positions in the following grades: four in grade GS-18, one in grade GS-17, and one in grade GS-16; and such positions shall be in addition to positions previously allocated to this agency under section 505 of said Act.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), ~~\$7,415,000~~ \$7,600,000: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including rental or lease of office space in foreign countries without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and serv-

ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$41,150,000.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies (including space adjustments) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of August 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521); ~~\$160,850,000~~ \$169,300,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to buildings, or parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appropriation for "Emergency operating expenses".

REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent

1 thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites acquired for public
 2 buildings; preliminary planning of projects by contract or
 3 otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equip-
 4 ment; \$58,000,000, to remain available until expended:
 5 *Provided*, That for the purposes of this appropriation, build-
 6 ings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase
 7 Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) shall be considered
 8 to be public buildings.

9 CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

10 For *an additional amount* for expenses, not otherwise
 11 provided for, necessary to construct public buildings projects
 12 and alter public buildings by extension or conversion where
 13 the estimated cost for a project is in excess of \$200,000 pur-
 14 suant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479),
 15 including equipment for such buildings, ~~\$144,836,000~~
 16 ~~\$171,980,000~~, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,
 17 That the foregoing amount shall be available for public build-
 18 ings projects, *subject to approval of any such project by*
 19 *resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of*
 20 *the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively*, at lo-
 21 cations and at maximum construction improvement costs
 22 (excluding funds for sites and expenses) as follows:

23 Post office and Federal office building, Camden, Arkan-
 24 sas, ~~\$633,250~~ \$655,050;

1 Courthouse and Federal office building, San Francisco,
2 California, ~~\$37,286,100~~ \$38,296,900;

3 Courthouse and Federal office building, Hartford, Con-
4 necticut, ~~\$7,636,400~~ \$7,816,400;

5 Federal office building, Miami, Florida, \$7,076,250;

6 Post office and courthouse, Thomasville, Georgia,
7 ~~\$1,094,000~~ \$1,119,600;

8 Border station, Jackman, Maine, \$289,850;

9 Border station, Van Buren, Maine, ~~\$284,750~~ \$297,550;

10 Border station, Vanceboro, Maine, ~~\$254,150~~ \$261,150;

11 Immigration and Naturalization Service center, (con-
12 struction and alteration) Detroit, Michigan, ~~\$874,650~~
13 \$895,050;

14 Border station, Sweetgrass, Montana, ~~\$586,500~~ \$615,-
15 600;

16 General Services Administration stores depot annex,
17 Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$469,200;

18 Post office and courthouse, Bismarck, North Dakota,
19 ~~\$3,224,050~~ \$3,283,050;

20 Federal office building, Toledo, Ohio, ~~\$3,867,700~~
21 \$3,980,700;

22 Post office and courthouse (construction and alteration),
23 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$5,601,500;

1 Courthouse and Federal office building, Memphis, Ten-
 2 nessee, ~~\$9,587,150~~ \$10,167,150;

3 Border station, El Paso, Texas, \$1,055,700;

4 Post office and Federal office building, Dayton, Wash-
 5 ington, ~~\$282,200~~ \$288,700;

6 *Federal Office Building Numbered Eight, District of*
 7 *Columbia, exclusive of laboratory and other equipment,*
 8 *\$15,794,000;*

9 *Federal Office Building Numbered Nine, District of*
 10 *Columbia, \$21,222,100;*

11 *Federal Office Building Numbered Ten, District of*
 12 *Columbia, \$40,803,500; and*

13 *United States Court of Claims and Court of Customs*
 14 *and Patent Appeals building, \$6,491,000: Provided further,*
 15 *That the foregoing limits of costs may be exceeded to the*
 16 *extent that savings are effected in other projects, but by*
 17 *not to exceed 5 10 per centum: Provided further, That not*
 18 *to exceed \$5,500,000 of the foregoing appropriation may*
 19 *be used for clearing the site and installing footings for the*
 20 *authorized public building project at Chicago, Illinois.*

21 SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

22 For an additional amount for expenses necessary in con-
 23 nection with the construction of public buildings projects
 24 not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in
 25 the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and

1 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings
 2 projects by contract or otherwise, ~~\$25,000,000~~ \$19,500,000,
 3 to remain available until expended: *Provided, That not to*
 4 ~~exceed \$5,500,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be~~
 5 ~~used for clearing the site and installing footings for the au-~~
 6 ~~thorized public building project at Chicago, Illinois.~~

7 CONSTRUCTION, FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING NUMBERED
 8 7, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

9 *“The appropriation contained in the Independent Offices*
 10 *Appropriation Act, 1959, under the head ‘Construction,*
 11 *United States Court of Claims and Federal Office Build-*
 12 *ing, Washington, District of Columbia’ is hereby made*
 13 *available for expenses necessary for the preparation of plans*
 14 *and specifications for a building in Washington, District*
 15 *of Columbia, for use of agencies of the executive branch*
 16 *of the Government without provision of space for the United*
 17 *States Court of Claims.*

18 PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

19 For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other
 20 obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the
 21 Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C.
 22 356), \$4,000,000.

23 CONSTRUCTION OF RELOCATION FACILITIES

24 *For expenses necessary for the construction of reloca-*
 25 *tion facility projects protected against fallout, pursuant to*

1 *the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), but sub-*
2 *ject to approval of any such project by resolutions adopted*
3 *by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House*
4 *of Representatives, respectively, \$3,800,000, to remain avail-*
5 *able until expended.*

6 OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

7 For necessary expenses of personal property manage-
8 ment and related activities as authorized by law and not
9 otherwise provided for, ~~\$3,716,500~~ \$4,240,000: *Provided,*
10 That not to exceed \$3,243,500 of any funds received during
11 the current or preceding fiscal year for deposit under section
12 204 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services
13 Act of 1949, as amended, and not otherwise disposed or by
14 law, shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and
15 shall be available for necessary expenses in carrying out the
16 functions of the General Services Administration under the
17 said Act, with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess
18 and surplus personal property.

19 EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

20 For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for
21 operation of the stores depot system and other procurement
22 services, including contractual services incident to receiv-
23 ing, handling, and shipping warehouse items, \$22,950,000.

1 OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND
2 RECORDS SERVICE

3 For necessary expenses in connection with Federal rec-
4 ords management and related activities as provided by law,
5 including reimbursement for security guard services, and
6 contractual services incident to movement or disposal of
7 records, \$9,420,000.

8 OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC
9 UTILITIES SERVICE

10 For necessary expenses of transportation and public
11 utilities management and related activities, as provided by
12 law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the
13 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to
14 exceed \$75 per diem for individuals, \$2,375,000.

15 STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

16 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions
17 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50
18 U.S.C. 98-98b), during the current fiscal year, for trans-
19 portation and handling, within the United States (including
20 charges at United States ports), storage, security, and main-
21 tenance of strategic and critical materials acquired for or
22 transferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant
23 to section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development

1 and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704 (b)), for carry-
2 ing out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act
3 of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462), relating to machine tools
4 and industrial manufacturing equipment for which the Gen-
5 eral Services Administration is responsible, including
6 reimbursement for security guard services, services as au-
7 thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
8 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed \$2,948,000 for operating
9 expenses, \$30,000,000, with which shall be merged the
10 unobligated balances of funds remaining available under this
11 head on June 30, 1960: *Provided*, That no part of funds
12 available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank
13 storage facilities: *Provided further*, That during the current
14 fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus
15 strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with
16 section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock
17 Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(a)), may be transferred to stock-
18 piles established in accordance with said Act: *Provided fur-*
19 *ther*, That any receipts from sales ~~or otherwise~~ during the
20 current fiscal year shall be promptly deposited into the
21 Treasury.

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

23 For expenses of executive direction for activities under
24 the control of the General Services Administration, \$240,000.

1 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER

2 PRESIDENTS

3 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August
4 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$250,000: *Provided*, That the
5 Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Sec-
6 retary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to
7 carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such
8 Act.

9 REFUNDS UNDER RENEGOTIATION ACT

10 For refunds under section 201 (f) of the Renegotiation
11 Act of 1951 (50 U.S.C. App. 1231 (f)), \$900,000, to
12 remain available until expended.

13 WORKING CAPITAL FUND

14 *To increase the capital of the "Working capital fund"*
15 *established by the Act of May 3, 1945 (40 U.S.C. 293),*
16 *\$100,000.*

17 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

18 Funds available to General Services Administration for
19 administrative operations, in support of program activities,
20 shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a
21 single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That
22 costs and obligations for such administrative operations for
23 the respective program activities shall be accounted for in
24 accordance with systems approved by the General Account-

1 ing Office: *Provided further*, That the total amount deposited
2 into said account for the fiscal year 1961 from funds made
3 available to General Services Administration in this Act
4 shall not exceed ~~\$13,000,000~~ \$13,300,000: *Provided fur-*
5 *ther*, That amounts deposited into said account for adminis-
6 trative operations for each program shall not exceed the
7 amounts included in the respective program appropriations
8 for such purposes.

9 GENERAL PROVISIONS

10 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the
11 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)
12 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,
13 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from
14 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129) ;
15 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to
16 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the
17 General Services Administration, issued by public author-
18 ities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in
19 respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator
20 deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the
21 request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be pro-
22 vided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and
23 (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and
24 transferred to the General Services Administration, in con-

1 nection with property transferred to the General Services
2 Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50
3 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so
4 transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

5 Appropriations under the head "Construction, Public
6 Buildings Projects" shall be available for acquisition of
7 buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation or
8 otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, or
9 for other approved ~~extension and conversion~~ projects outside
10 the District of Columbia.

11 Funds available to the General Services Administration
12 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

13 No part of any money appropriated by this or any other
14 Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Govern-
15 ment shall be used during the current fiscal year for the pur-
16 chase within the continental limits of the United States of
17 any typewriting machines except in accordance with regula-
18 tions issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Prop-
19 erty and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

20 Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made
21 available to the General Services Administration for the cur-
22 rent fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other
23 such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be in-

1 creased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided*, That
2 such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and
3 shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$2,000,000.

4 Appropriations available to any department or agency
5 during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, in-
6 cluding maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be
7 available for reimbursement to the General Services Admin-
8 istration for those expenses of renovation and alteration of
9 buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements,
10 performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of
11 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law.

12 *General Services Administration shall not construct any*
13 *office building for any civilian agency or any Government-*
14 *owned or partially owned corporation, except Federal Re-*
15 *serve banks, nor shall any civilian agency or Government-*
16 *owned or partially owned corporation, except the Federal*
17 *Reserve banks, build any office building until the office build-*
18 *ing has been authorized by the Congress or its proper com-*
19 *mittees.*

20 *In disposing of surplus real estate and buildings a rea-*
21 *sonable period of time shall be allowed for local governmental*
22 *units to perfect a comprehensive and coordinated plan of*
23 *use and procurement.*

1 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

2 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administra-
5 tor, including rent in the District of Columbia; services as
6 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
7 U.S.C. 55a) ; and purchase of two passenger motor vehicles
8 for replacement only; \$10,327,000: *Provided*, That neces-
9 sary expenses of inspections and of providing repre-
10 sentatives at the site of projects being planned or under-
11 taken by local public agencies pursuant to title I of the
12 Housing Act of 1949, as amended, projects financed through
13 loans to educational institutions authorized by title IV of the
14 Housing Act of 1950, as amended, and projects and facilities
15 financed by loans to public agencies pursuant to title II of
16 the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be
17 compensated by such agencies or institutions by the payment
18 of fixed fees which in the aggregate will cover the costs of
19 rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose shall
20 be considered nonadministrative; and for the purpose of pro-
21 viding such inspections, the Administrator may utilize any
22 agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or pay-
23 ment for such services from such institutions, or the Admin-

1 istrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropriations
2 or funds against which such charges have been made, but
3 such nonadministrative expenses shall not exceed \$2,900,000.

4 URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

5 For grants in accordance with the provisions of section
6 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, \$4,000,000.

7 RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS (PAYMENT TO
8 REVOLVING FUND)

9 For payment to the revolving fund established pur-
10 suant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as
11 amended (40 U.S.C. 462), \$6,000,000.

12 GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

13 For an additional amount for payment of grants as
14 authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended
15 (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), \$150,000,000.

16 HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY (PAYMENT TO REVOLVING
17 FUND)

18 For payment to the revolving fund established pursuant
19 to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, \$5,000,000.

20 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

21 ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

22 For the payment of annual contributions to public hous-
23 ing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United

1 States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410),
2 \$140,000,000.

3 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

4 For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Ad-
5 ministration, \$13,050,000, to be expended under the author-
6 ization for such expenses contained in title II of this Act.

7 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce
10 Commission, including not to exceed \$5,000 for the employ-
11 ment of special counsel; services as authorized by section
12 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates
13 not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals; and purchase of
14 not to exceed thirty-three passenger motor vehicles of which
15 twenty-seven shall be for replacement only; ~~\$19,777,000~~
16 \$20,500,000, of which not less than \$1,567,000 shall be
17 available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety
18 activities and not less than \$1,094,500 shall be available for
19 expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection
20 activities: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and co-
21 operating State commissioners may use Government trans-
22 portation requests when traveling in connection with their
23 duties as such.

1 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

2 ADMINISTRATION

3 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

4 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of
5 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, includ-
6 ing hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed ~~\$4,900,~~
7 ~~000~~ \$5,849,000 for expenses of travel; and uniforms or
8 allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September
9 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); ~~\$166,500,000~~
10 \$170,760,000.

11 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

12 For contractual research, development, operations, tech-
13 nical services, repairs, alterations, and minor construction,
14 and for supplies, materials, and equipment necessary for the
15 conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and
16 development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space
17 Administration; and purchase of ~~forty-five~~ *sixty* passenger
18 motor vehicles, of which twenty-nine shall be for replacement
19 only; ~~\$602,240,000~~ \$671,453,000, to remain available until
20 expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall
21 be available for payment of salaries of National Aeronautics
22 and Space Administration personnel.

23 CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

24 For construction and equipment for the National Aero-
25 nautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or

1 condemnation of real property as authorized by law, \$107,
2 ~~275,000~~ \$122,787,000, to remain available until expended.

3 GENERAL PROVISIONS

4 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made
5 available to the National Aeronautics and Space Adminis-
6 tration by this Act may be transferred to any other such
7 appropriation, but the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation
8 shall not be thereby increased.

9 *Not to exceed \$20,000 of appropriations in this Act for*
10 *the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall*
11 *be available for scientific consultations and any emergency*
12 *or extraordinary expense pursuant to section 1(f) of the*
13 *legislative authorization for appropriations for the fiscal year*
14 *1961.*

15 ~~NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY~~

16 ~~OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES~~

17 For the operation and maintenance of properties under
18 title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, \$40,-
19 000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases,
20 or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the
21 United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so long as
22 funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing
23 purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act

1 of 1950 (~~Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress~~), shall not
2 be effective.

3 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

4 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

5 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
6 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42
7 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including award of graduate fellow-
8 ships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
9 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50
10 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
11 and reimbursement of the General Services Administration
12 for security guard services; ~~\$160,000,000~~ \$191,600,000, to
13 remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the fore-
14 going amount not less than \$30,250,000 shall be available for
15 tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program
16 of supplementary training for secondary school science and
17 mathematics teachers: *Provided further*, That not to exceed
18 \$1,600,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used to
19 purchase foreign currencies which accrue under title
20 I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance
21 Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the pur-
22 poses authorized by section 104 (k) of that Act.

1 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-
4 cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as
5 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
6 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for indi-
7 viduals, \$2,870,000.

8 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

9 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

10 For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allow-
11 ances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131),
12 and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act
13 of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), ~~\$8,525,000~~ \$9,300,000.

14 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For expenses necessary for the operation and mainte-
17 nance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title
18 I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62
19 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by
20 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a);
21 purchase of eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement
22 only, including one at not to exceed \$4,000; not to exceed

1 \$61,536 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board;
 2 and \$19,140 for the National Advisory Committee on the
 3 Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists;
 4 ~~\$30,278,400~~ \$32,778,400: *Provided*, That during the cur-
 5 rent fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation
 6 from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the
 7 Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such ac-
 8 tion to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

9 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

10 GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

11 For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad-
 12 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses
 13 incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uni-
 14 forms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; reim-
 15 bursement of the General Services Administration for secu-
 16 rity guard service; and not to exceed \$67,000 for preparation,
 17 shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic
 18 displays, moving pictures, and other visual education infor-
 19 mation and descriptive material, including purchase or
 20 rental of equipment; \$153,500,000: *Provided*, That no part
 21 of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-
 22 two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided fur-*
 23 *ther*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay
 24 educational institutions for reports and certifications of at-
 25 tendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess

1 of \$1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and
2 attending such institution.

3 MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS

4 OPERATING EXPENSES

5 For expenses necessary for administration of the medical,
6 hospital, domiciliary, special service, construction and supply,
7 research, and employee education and training activities, and
8 expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical re-
9 search, as authorized by law, ~~\$30,000,000~~ \$39,000,000, of
10 which ~~\$17,000,000~~ \$26,000,000 shall be available for medi-
11 cal research: *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 of the foregoing
12 appropriations shall remain available until expended for
13 prosthetic testing and development.

14 INPATIENT CARE

15 For expenses necessary for the maintenance and opera-
16 tion of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and for the care
17 and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration
18 in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Admin-
19 istration as authorized by law, including the furnishing of
20 recreational articles and facilities; maintenance and operation
21 of farms; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities
22 in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of
23 the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either
24 by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and pur-
25 chase of materials; purchase of ninety-four passenger

1 motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allow-
2 ances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1,
3 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; and aid to State or
4 Territorial homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38,
5 United States Code, for the support of veterans eligible for
6 admission to Veterans Administration facilities for hospital
7 or domiciliary care; \$817,021,000, plus reimbursements:
8 *Provided*, That allotments and transfers may be made from
9 this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education,
10 and Welfare (Public Health Service) , the Army, Navy, and
11 Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them under the
12 various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such
13 amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of bene-
14 ficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

15 OUTPATIENT CARE

16 For expenses necessary for furnishing outpatient care to
17 beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, as authorized
18 by law; purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replace-
19 ment only; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as author-
20 ized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; \$86,481,000.

21 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF SUPPLY DEPOTS

22 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
23 of supply depots, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as
24 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131) , \$2,500,000.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances (including burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities, the administration of which is now or may hereafter be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended \$3,800,000,000, to remain available until expended.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equipment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, \$344,000,000, to remain available until expended.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, for national service life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-disabled veterans insurance, \$48,800,000, to remain avail-

1 able until expended: *Provided*, That certain premiums pro-
2 vided by law to be credited to the "Military and naval
3 insurance" or "National service life insurance" appropria-
4 tions shall hereafter be credited to appropriations granted
5 under this head which shall be subject to the same statutory
6 provisions and shall be available for the same purpose as
7 formerly applied to the appropriations for "Military and naval
8 insurance", "National service life insurance", and "Service-
9 men's indemnities".

10 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

11 For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants
12 in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United
13 States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treat-
14 ment of veterans, \$1,500,000.

15 CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY
16 FACILITIES

17 For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and
18 for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and ex-
19 tending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the
20 Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth
21 in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States
22 Code, \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended.

23 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

24 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for
25 the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions",

1 “Readjustment benefits”, and “Veterans insurance and in-
2 demnities” may be transferred to any other of the mentioned
3 appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the
4 appropriations so augmented.

5 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration
6 for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall
7 be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the
8 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

9 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administra-
10 tion for the current fiscal year for “Inpatient care” and
11 “Outpatient care” shall be available for funeral, burial, and
12 other expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards au-
13 thorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code),
14 for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving
15 care under such appropriations.

16 No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Vet-
17 erans Administration (except the appropriation for “Con-
18 struction of hospital and domiciliary facilities”) shall be
19 available for the purchase of any site for or toward the
20 construction of any new hospital or home.

21 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-
22 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons except
23 beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits
24 to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the

1 appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Adminis-
2 trator of Veterans Affairs.

3 INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

4 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are ex-
5 pendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific
6 limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such
7 travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth there-
8 for in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations:
9 *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel per-
10 formed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal
11 boards of the Selective Service System, or to travel per-
12 formed in connection with the investigation of aircraft acci-
13 dents by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

14 SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this
15 title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling
16 a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held
17 by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of
18 the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period
19 of active military or naval service and has within
20 ninety days after his release from such service or from hospi-
21 talization continuing after discharge for a period of not more
22 than one year made application for restoration to his former
23 position and has been certified by the Civil Service Commis-
24 sion as still qualified to perform the duties of his former posi-
25 tion and has not been restored thereto.

1 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available
2 by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase
3 or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new of-
4 fices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this
5 limitation shall not apply to programs which have been ap-
6 proved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

7 TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

8 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,
9 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the
10 limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each
11 such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to
12 make such contracts and commitments without regard to
13 fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the
14 Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may
15 be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the
16 Budget for the fiscal year 1961 for each such corporation
17 or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

18 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

19 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXAMINATION 20 EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

21 Not to exceed a total of \$1,943,000 shall be avail-
22 able for administrative expenses of the Federal Home
23 Loan Bank Board, and shall be derived from funds available
24 to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in
25 the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and

1 receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration,
2 the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home Loan
3 Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years,
4 and the Board may utilize and may make payment for
5 services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the
6 Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insur-
7 ance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government
8 (including payment for office space) : *Provided*, That all
9 necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship
10 of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan
11 Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of pro-
12 ceedings under section 5 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan
13 Act of 1933 or section 407 of the National Housing Act and
14 all necessary expenses (including services performed on a
15 contract or fee basis, but not including other personal serv-
16 ices) in connection with the handling, including the pur-
17 chase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal
18 home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of,
19 or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the
20 Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-
21 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes here-
22 of: *Provided further*, That hereafter expenses of the Board
23 in making studies or investigations specifically directed by
24 law, or requested by the Congress or either House thereof or
25 by a committee of either House, including services authorized

1 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
 2 shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses: *Provided*
 3 *further*, That members and alternates of the Federal Savings
 4 and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reimburse-
 5 ment from the Board as approved by the Board for trans-
 6 portation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of or
 7 concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid
 8 not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided*
 9 *further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this
 10 Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore speci-
 11 fied, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the
 12 Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance
 13 with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of
 14 July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449): *Pro-*
 15 *vided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses for the
 16 examination of Federal and State chartered institutions
 17 (other than special examinations determined by the Board
 18 to be necessary) shall not exceed ~~\$8,141,000~~ \$8,341,000.

19 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL

20 SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

21 Not to exceed ~~\$787,500~~ \$800,000 shall be available for
 22 administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual
 23 basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation,
 24 properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection
 25 with liquidation of insured institutions or preparation for

1 or conduct of proceedings under section 407 of the National
 2 Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived
 3 from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action
 4 for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of
 5 losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and ex-
 6 penses, and payments for administrative expenses of the
 7 Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board
 8 to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said
 9 Corporation may utilize and may make payment for services
 10 and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal
 11 Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and
 12 other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwith-
 13 standing any other provisions of this Act, except for the
 14 limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administra-
 15 tive expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall
 16 be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV
 17 of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724-
 18 1730); ~~and such other obligations of said corporation shall~~
 19 ~~not exceed \$887,800.~~

20 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

21 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL 22 FACILITIES CORPORATION

23 Not to exceed \$20,000 shall be available during the
 24 fiscal year 1961 for all administrative expenses of the
 25 Corporation (including use of the services and facilities

1 of Federal Reserve banks), to be computed on an accrual
2 basis, and to be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, cap-
3 italized expenditures, expenses in connection with the
4 acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improve-
5 ment, or disposition of real or personal property belonging
6 to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, expenses
7 of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection
8 with the performance of legal services, and all administrative
9 expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies.

10 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECON-
11 STRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION
12 FUND

13 Not to exceed \$40,000 (to be computed on an accrual
14 basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of
15 Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General
16 Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1
17 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the cur-
18 rent fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the
19 liquidation of said functions: *Provided*, That as used herein
20 the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to
21 include all salaries and wages, services performed on a con-
22 tract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including
23 the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative
24 offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of services
25 performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the

1 termination of contracts or in the performance of legal
2 services: *Provided further*, That the distribution of adminis-
3 trative expenses to the account shall be made in accordance
4 with generally recognized accounting principles and prac-
5 tices.

6 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

7 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
8 THE ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

9 Not to exceed ~~\$1,260,000~~ \$1,400,000 shall be available
10 for all administrative expenses, which shall be on an ac-
11 crual basis, of carrying out the functions of the Admin-
12 istrator under the program of housing loans to educational
13 institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as
14 amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d), but this amount shall
15 be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the
16 Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Fed-
17 eral home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the
18 meaning of the Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance
19 Corporation (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12
20 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary
21 of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the
22 United States.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
2 THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

3 Not to exceed ~~\$477,000~~ \$530,000 of funds in the re-
4 volving fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing
5 Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for ad-
6 ministrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of
7 payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve
8 banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan
9 banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act
10 creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of
11 August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has
12 been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a de-
13 pository of public money of the United States.

14 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
15 THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDAT-
16 ING PROGRAMS)

17 During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$139,500
18 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this
19 amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case
20 of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Gov-
21 ernment and legal services on a contract or fee basis and
22 of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve

1 banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the
2 Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-
3 loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of
4 the Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Fed-
5 eral Deposit Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which
6 has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a
7 depository of public money of the United States.

8 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
9 NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

10 Not to exceed \$6,550,000 shall be available for
11 administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual
12 basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses
13 (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed
14 on a contract or fee basis) in connection with the
15 issuance and servicing of securities, depreciation, properly
16 capitalized expenditures, fees for servicing mortgages, ex-
17 penses (including services performed on a force account,
18 contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal serv-
19 ices) in connection with the acquisition, protection, opera-
20 tion, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or
21 personal property belonging to said Association or in which
22 it has an interest, cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other
23 expenses of persons employed outside of the continental
24 United States, expenses of services performed on a contract
25 or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal serv-

ices, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies, and said Association may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

For administrative expenses in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed \$8,450,000 \$8,650,000 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided*, That funds shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to exceed \$1,500) ÷ ~~*Provided further*, That nonadministrative expenses of all kinds regardless of source classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, including all appraisal fees regardless of source or method of financing shall not exceed \$50,000,000: *Provided further*, That nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not~~

1 exceed \$50,000,000: *Provided further, That in addition to*
2 *the foregoing limitation, there may be apportioned for use,*
3 *pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended,*
4 *such additional amounts (not exceeding in the aggregate 15*
5 *per centum of such limitation) as may be necessary to process*
6 *workload in connection with mortgage insurance applica-*
7 *tions which the Commissioner may determine to be necessary*
8 *to avoid undue inconvenience of hardship to the housing*
9 *industry and the public.*

10 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
11 TIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

12 Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such ex-
13 penses by title I of this Act shall be available for the
14 administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administra-
15 tion in carrying out the provisions of the United States
16 Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401-1433) ;
17 purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized
18 by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C.
19 2131) ; and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor
20 vehicle for replacement only: *Provided, That necessary*
21 *expenses of providing representatives of the Administra-*
22 *tion at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with*
23 *the construction of such non-Federal projects by public*
24 *housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be*
25 *compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees*

1 which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs
2 of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such serv-
3 ices, and expenditures by the Administration for such
4 purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and
5 funds received from such payments may be used only for
6 the payment of necessary expenses of providing representa-
7 tives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal
8 projects: *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public
9 Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act,
10 in carrying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed
11 \$1,200,000.

12 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

13 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in
14 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
15 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used
16 for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support
17 or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

18 SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in
19 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
20 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to
21 pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel
22 work in excess of the number that would be provided by a
23 ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five,
24 or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent em-
25 ployees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided*,

1 That for purposes of this section employees shall be con-
2 sidered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-
3 time or more in personnel administration consisting of
4 direction and administration of the personnel program;
5 employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and
6 classification; employee relations and services; ~~committees~~
7 ~~of expert examiners and boards of civil-service examiners;~~
8 wage administration; and processing, recording, and
9 reporting.

10 SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this
11 Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-
12 poration or agency included in this Act, shall be used for
13 construction of fallout shelters in Government-owned or
14 leased buildings except where specifically provided.

15 This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices
16 Appropriation Act, 1961".

Passed the House of Representatives April 20, 1960.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS,

Clerk.

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11776

[Report No. 1611]

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

APRIL 21, 1960

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Appropriations

JUNE 17, 1960

Reported with amendments

June 22, 1960

10. APPROPRIATIONS; ITEM VETO. Rep. Schwengel reviewed the arguments, pro and con, concerning proposals to give the President authority to veto individual items in appropriation bills. pp. 12854-6
11. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack stated that the supplemental appropriation bill will be considered next after the farm bill is disposed of. p. 12798

SENATE

12. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Passed by a vote of 75 to 8, with amendments, this bill, H. R. 11776. (pp. ~~12726~~, 12726-45) Senate conferees were appointed. p. 12745
13. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Passed by a vote of 81 to 1, with amendments, this bill, H. R. 11389. (pp. 12745, 12749-55) Senate conferees were appointed. p. 12755
14. CIVIL DEFENSE. Sen. Young criticized the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization as being outdated and called for a scrapping of "civil defense as now conducted." p. 12682
15. FORESTRY. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. J. Res. 95, to provide for the acceleration of the various reforestation programs of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior (S. Rept. 1653). p. 12672
16. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Humphrey criticized the administration programs in the fields of rural development, strategic stockpiling of food, national and international food and fiber program, and industrial uses. Sens. Dirksen and Case defended the administration programs and discussed the Public Law 480 program. pp. 12712-24
17. FOREST ROADS. The Public Works Committee voted to report with amendments (but did not actually report) H. R. 10495, to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways, including authorization for the construction of forest highways and forest development roads and trails. The "Daily Digest" states that the bill was amended to include the language of S. 3290, which extends the share payable on public domain roads, exclusive of those on forest lands, and S. 3412, relating to payments on Federal-aid projects undertaken by a Federal agency. p. D592
18. LANDS. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) H. R. 11522, authorizing conveyance of certain U. S. land to States and other political subdivisions for highway improvements, and S. 3260, authorizing the Secretary of the Army to modify certain leases entered into for the provision of recreational facilities in reservoir areas. p. D593
The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 2806, to revise the boundaries of the Coronado National Memorial and to authorize the repair and maintenance of an access road thereto (S. Rept. 1654). pp. 12671-2
19. TRANSPORTATION. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee reported with amendments S. 3228, relating to the issuance of certificates of convenience and necessity by the ICC to certain common carriers by motor vehicle (S. Rept. 1648). p. 12671

20. PERSONNEL. The Post Office and Civil Service Committee reported with amendments H. R. 7758, to improve the administration of overseas activities of the U. S. Government (S. Rept. 1647). p. 12671
The Government Operations Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. Res. 338, relating to tenure of office of individuals appointed to Government administrative and policymaking posts; and with amendment, H. R. 5196, to increase the per diem allowance for Government employees in a travel status from \$12 to \$16. p. D592
21. VETERANS' BENEFITS. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee reported with amendments S. 3274, to permit certain veterans pursuing courses of vocational rehabilitation training to continue in pursuit thereof for such period as may be necessary to complete such courses (S. Rept. 1644); and with amendment, S. 3275, to extend, with respect to World War II veterans, guaranteed loan programs relating to home, farm, and business loans (S. Rept. 1646). p. 12672
22. MINERALS. Passed as reported H. R. 10445, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of Feb. 25, 1920. (pp. 12757-61) Senate conferees were appointed (p. 12761).
23. MINIMUM WAGE. The Labor and Public Welfare Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) an original bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act relating to minimum wage. The "Daily Digest" states that, as approved, the bill would increase "the minimum wage to \$1.15 per hour for the first year, \$1.20 an hour for the second year, and \$1.25 an hour thereafter; and would provide coverage for an additional 5 million employees, principally in the retail and service trades." p. D592
24. WATER. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) S. 3625, to establish a Wabash Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission. p. D592
25. AIR POLLUTION. The Public Works Committee voted to report (but did not actually report) with amendment S. 3108, to provide for public hearings on air pollution problems, and to extend the duration of the air pollution control law. pp. D592-3
Sen. Keating urged support for legislation to combat air pollution and inserted a letter from HEW pointing out the need for such legislation. pp. 12711-2
26. WATERSHEDS. The Public Works Committee approved the following watershed projects: Big Prairie and French Creeks, Ala.; Misteguary Creek, Mich.; Upper Black Bear Creek, Okla.; Mill Run, Pa.; Reelfoot-Indian Creeks, Tenn.; and Olmitos and Garcias Creeks, Tex. p. D593
27. AUDIT REPORT. Both Houses received an audit report on the Federal Housing Administration and the Housing and Home Finance Agency for the fiscal year 1959. pp. 12671, 12859
28. LAMB AND WOOL IMPORTS. Sen. Mansfield inserted an article commending Sen. McGee's recent speech in the Senate in support of "fixed quotas on imports of live sheep and lambs, lamb and mutton." pp. 12694-5

86TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 11776

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 22, 1960

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the Senate numbered

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money
4 in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry
5 independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, cor-
6 porations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending
7 June 30, 1961, namely:

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE

MOBILIZATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; ~~(1)~~ *not to exceed \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive;* and not to exceed \$900,000 for expenses of travel; ~~(2)~~ *\$24,700,000 \$25,200,000(3),— of which \$185,000 shall be available for the Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Committee(4): Provided, That one contract for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), for not to exceed one person, may be renewed annually at a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75 : Provided, That contracts for not to exceed four persons under this appropriation for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act*

1 *of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be renewed annu-*
 2 *ally, and one such contract, for the services of an expert or*
 3 *consultant for telecommunications, may provide for a per*
 4 *diem rate of not to exceed \$75.*

5 CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS
 6 OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

7 For expenses necessary to enable other Federal agencies
 8 to perform such civil defense and defense mobilization func-
 9 tions as may be designated by the Office of Civil and Defense
 10 Mobilization, including payments by the Department of
 11 Labor to State employment security agencies for the full cost
 12 of administration of defense manpower mobilization activi-
 13 ties, \$6,250,000.

14 FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

15 For financial contributions to the States for civil defense
 16 purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950,
 17 as amended, to be equally matched with State funds,
 18 ~~(5)\$10,000,000~~ \$22,000,000, ~~(6)of which none shall be~~
 19 ~~allocated to the States pursuant to section 205 of said Act~~
 20 ~~of which not to exceed \$12,000,000 shall be available for~~
 21 ~~allocation to the States pursuant to section 205 of said~~
 22 ~~Act(7):~~ *Provided, That expenditures heretofore made under*
 23 *this appropriation head in reliance upon a certification of the*
 24 *appropriate State official for obligations incurred or expendi-*
 25 *tures made by a State or subdivision thereof prior to the*

1 *availability of the applicable Federal appropriation are*
2 *hereby ratified and confirmed if otherwise proper.*

3 EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

4 For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing,
5 distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense
6 materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of
7 the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended,
8 ~~(8)\$6,950,000~~ \$11,400,000.

9 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

10 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
11 studies and research to develop measures and plans for
12 evacuation, shelter, and the protection of life and property,
13 as authorized by section 201 (d) of the Federal Civil Defense
14 Act of 1950, as amended, including services as authorized
15 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
16 \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which
17 not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available to complete the
18 two-year program of fallout shelter prototype construction.

19 No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be avail-
20 able for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of
21 warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed
22 specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense
23 Mobilization.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including contract stenographic reporting services; employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; purchase (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per diem; ~~(9)\$7,285,000~~ \$7,500,000.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, ~~(10)\$60,000,000,~~ \$68,984,000, to remain available until expended.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$22,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed \$10,000

1 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private
 2 physicians on a fee basis; payment in advance for library
 3 membership in societies whose publications are available to
 4 members only or to members at a price lower than to the
 5 general public; not to exceed \$77,000 for performing the
 6 duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19,
 7 1940 (54 Stat. 767) ; reimbursement of the General Services
 8 Administration for security guard services for protection of
 9 confidential files; and not to exceed \$5,000 for actuarial
 10 services by contract, without regard to section 3709, Revised
 11 Statutes, as amended; ~~(11)\$19,230,000~~ \$19,580,000: *Pro-*
 12 *vided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available
 13 for the Career Executive Board established by Executive
 14 Order 10758 of March 4, 1958, as amended.

15 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
 16 Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and
 17 expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and
 18 Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established
 19 pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943.

20 No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil
 21 Service Commission shall be available for printing the Official
 22 Register of the United States~~(12)~~, and the Act of August 28,
 23 1938 (49 Stat. 956), as amended by the Act of August 27,
 24 1951 (65 Stat. 198), is hereby repealed.

1 INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EM-
2 PLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

3 For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of
4 Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended,
5 prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary
6 General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of
7 other international organizations, certain information con-
8 cerning United States citizens employed, or being considered
9 for employment by such organizations, including services as
10 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946
11 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$400,000: *Provided*, That this appro-
12 priation shall be available for advances or reimbursements
13 to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil
14 Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation
15 for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive
16 order: *Provided further*, That members of the International
17 Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual
18 transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence
19 authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended,
20 while traveling on official business away from their homes
21 or regular places of business, including periods while en route
22 to and from and at the place where their services are to be
23 performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in sections 281
24 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of

1 the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed to apply
2 to any person because of appointment for part-time or in-
3 termittent service as a member of the International Organiza-
4 tions Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Commis-
5 sion as established by Executive Order 10422, dated January
6 9, 1953, as amended.

7 ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

8 For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May
9 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of
10 August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775),
11 \$2,316,000.

12 GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES

13 HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

14 For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund" of
15 Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as
16 authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health
17 Benefits Act (73 Stat. 713), \$2,500,000, to remain avail-
18 able until expended.

19 PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DIS-

20 ABILITY FUND

21 For financing the annuity benefits and increases, during
22 the current fiscal year, provided by the Act of June 25,
23 1958 (72 Stat. 218), \$46,329,000, to be credited to the
24 civil service retirement and disability fund.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES

2 LIFE INSURANCE FUND

3 Not to exceed \$250,000 of the funds in the "Em-
 4 ployees' Life Insurance Fund" shall be available for
 5 reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for ad-
 6 ministrative expenses incurred by the Commission during
 7 the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal
 8 Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended
 9 (5 U.S.C. 2091-2103): *Provided*, That this limitation
 10 shall include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act,
 11 notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law
 12 85-377 (5 U.S.C. 2094 (c)).

13 FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

14 EXPENSES

15 For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency,
 16 not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses
 17 for research and development and for establishment of air
 18 navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the
 19 Federal Airport Act; purchase of twenty passenger motor
 20 vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed \$5,000 for
 21 representation allowances and for official entertainment; and
 22 purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; ~~(13)~~ ~~\$365,245,-~~
 23 ~~000~~ \$380,883,000: *Provided*, That there may be credited to

1 this appropriation, funds received from States, counties,
2 municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources,
3 for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air
4 navigation facilities.

5 ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

6 For an additional amount for the acquisition, establish-
7 ment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of
8 air navigation facilities, including the initial acquisition of
9 necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and fur-
10 nishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers
11 and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at
12 remote localities where such accommodations are not avail-
13 able (at a total cost of construction of not to exceed \$50,000
14 per housing unit in Alaska) ; purchase of ~~five~~ *seven* aircraft;
15 and the initial flight checking of air navigation facilities and
16 the transportation by air to and from and within Alaska and
17 the Territories of the United States of materials and equip-
18 ment secured under this appropriation; ~~(14)~~ ~~\$152,500,000~~
19 ~~\$174,000,000~~, to remain available until expended: *Provided,*
20 That there may be credited to this appropriation funds re-
21 ceived from States, counties, municipalities, other public au-
22 thorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the
23 establishment of air navigation facilities.

1 GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF
2 CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

3 For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority
4 granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to
5 enter into contracts, \$80,000,000, to remain available until
6 expended.

7 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

8 For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for
9 research, development, and service testing, including con-
10 struction of experimental facilities and acquisition of neces-
11 sary sites by lease or grant, \$64,000,000, to remain available
12 until expended.

13 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL
14 AIRPORT

15 For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-
16 nance, improvement and protection of the Washington
17 National Airport, including purchase of one passenger motor
18 vehicle, for replacement only, for police-type use which may
19 exceed by \$300 the general purchase price limitation for
20 the current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of
21 uniforms; and arms and ammunition; \$3,230,000.

1 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES INTERNATIONAL
2 AIRPORT

3 For expenses incident to the care, operation, mainte-
4 nance, improvement and protection of the Dulles Interna-
5 tional Airport, including purchase of four passenger motor
6 vehicles, of which three for police-type use may exceed by
7 \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the
8 current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of uni-
9 forms; and arms and ammunition; \$2,450,000.

10 CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

11 For necessary expenses for construction at Washington
12 National Airport, including acquisition of land, \$4,500,000,
13 to remain available until expended.

14 GENERAL PROVISION

15 During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations
16 to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the
17 Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified
18 in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C.
19 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Admin-
20 istrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance and
21 operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and
22 aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized
23 by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C.
24 2131).

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including land and structures (not to exceed \$23,000), special counsel fees, improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to exceed \$14,600), services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), ~~(15)~~*not to exceed \$172,000 for expenses of travel*, and purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, ~~(16)~~~~\$12,935,000~~ *\$13,135,000: Provided, That not to exceed \$2,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for a special ultra-high frequency television study and shall remain available until June 30, 1962.*

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission, as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, ~~(17)~~~~\$7,532,000~~ *\$7,795,000*, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be available for special counsel and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not exceeding \$50 per diem for individuals ~~(18)~~*: Provided, That the Commission is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed in the Classi-*

1 *fication Act of 1949, as amended, but without regard to the*
2 *numerical limitations contained therein, to place six General*
3 *Schedule positions in the following grades: four in Grade*
4 *GS-18, one in grade GS-17, and one in grade GS-16; and*
5 *such positions shall be in addition to positions previously al-*
6 *located to this agency under section 505 of said Act.*

7 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

8 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

9 For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commis-
10 sion, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as author-
11 ized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by
12 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
13 (19)~~\$7,415,000~~ \$7,600,000: *Provided, That no part of the*
14 *foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investiga-*
15 *tion hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Con-*
16 *gress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enact-*
17 *ment of such resolution to finance the cost of such*
18 *investigation.*

19 GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office,
22 including rental or lease of office space in foreign countries
23 without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the
24 Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and serv-

ices as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$41,150,000.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies (including space adjustments) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of August 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521); ~~(20)\$160,850,000~~ *\$169,300,000: Provided, That this appropriation shall be available, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to buildings, or parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appropriation for "Emergency operating expenses".*

REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent

1 thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites acquired for public
 2 buildings; preliminary planning of projects by contract or
 3 otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equip-
 4 ment; \$58,000,000, to remain available until expended:
 5 *Provided*, That for the purposes of this appropriation, build-
 6 ings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase
 7 Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) shall be considered
 8 to be public buildings.

9 CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

10 For ~~(21)~~ *an additional amount for expenses, not other-*
 11 *wise provided for, necessary to construct public buildings proj-*
 12 *ects and alter public buildings by extension or conversion*
 13 *where the estimated cost for a project is in excess of \$200,000*
 14 *pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479),*
 15 *including equipment for such buildings, ~~(22)~~\$144,836,000*
 16 *\$171,980,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*,*
 17 *That the foregoing amount shall be available for public build-*
 18 *ings projects~~(23)~~, subject to approval of any such project by*
 19 *resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of*
 20 *the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, at lo-*
 21 *cations and at maximum construction improvement costs*
 22 *(excluding funds for sites and expenses) as follows:*

23 Post office and Federal office building, Camden, Arkan-
 24 sas, ~~(24)~~\$633,250 \$655,050;

1 Courthouse and Federal office building, San Francisco,
2 California, ~~(25)\$37,286,100~~ \$38,296,900;

3 Courthouse and Federal office building, Hartford, Con-
4 necticut, ~~(26)\$7,636,400~~ \$7,816,400;

5 Federal office building, Miami, Florida, \$7,076,250;

6 Post office and courthouse, Thomasville, Georgia,
7 ~~(27)\$1,094,000~~ \$1,119,600;

8 Border station, Jackman, Maine, \$289,850;

9 Border station, Van Buren, Maine, ~~(28)\$284,750~~
10 \$297,550;

11 Border station, Vanceboro, Maine, ~~(29)\$254,150~~
12 \$261,150;

13 Immigration and Naturalization Service center, (con-
14 struction and alteration) Detroit, Michigan, ~~(30)\$874,650~~
15 \$895,050;

16 Border station, Sweetgrass, Montana, ~~(31)\$586,500~~
17 \$615,600;

18 General Services Administration stores depot annex,
19 Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$469,200;

20 Post office and courthouse, Bismarck, North Dakota,
21 ~~(32)\$3,224,050~~ \$3,283,050;

22 Federal office building, Toledo, Ohio, ~~(33)\$3,867,700~~
23 \$3,980,700;

1 Post office and courthouse (construction and alteration),
 2 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$5,601,500;

3 Courthouse and Federal office building, Memphis, Ten-
 4 nessee, (34)~~\$9,587,150~~ \$10,167,150;

5 Border station, El Paso, Texas, \$1,055,700;

6 Post office and Federal office building, Dayton, Wash-
 7 ington, (35)~~\$282,200~~ \$288,700;

8 (36)*Federal Office Building Numbered Eight, District of*
 9 *Columbia, exclusive of laboratory and other equipment,*
 10 *\$15,794,000;*

11 (37)*Federal Office Building Numbered Nine, District of*
 12 *Columbia, \$21,222,100;*

13 (38)*Federal Office Building Numbered Ten, District of*
 14 *Columbia, \$40,803,500; and*

15 (39)*United States Court of Claims and Court of Customs*
 16 *and Patent Appeals building, \$6,491,000: Provided further,*

17 *That the foregoing limits of costs may be exceeded to the*
 18 *extent that savings are effected in other projects, but by*

19 *not to exceed (40)5 10 per centum(41): Provided further,*

20 *That not to exceed \$5,500,000 of the foregoing appropria-*
 21 *tion may be used for clearing the site and installing footings*
 22 *for the authorized public building project at Chicago, Illinois.*

23 SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

24 For an additional amount for expenses necessary in con-
 25 nection with the construction of public buildings projects

not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, ~~(42)\$25,000,000~~ \$19,500,000, to remain available until expended ~~(43): Provided,~~ That not to exceed \$5,500,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used for clearing the site and installing footings for the authorized public building project at Chicago, Illinois.

~~(44)~~CONSTRUCTION, FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING NUMBERED 7, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The appropriation contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the head 'Construction, United States Court of Claims and Federal Office Building, Washington, District of Columbia' is hereby made available for expenses necessary for the preparation of plans and specifications for a building in Washington, District of Columbia, for use of agencies of the executive branch of the Government without provision of space for the United States Court of Claims.

PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), \$4,000,000.

1 (45)CONSTRUCTION OF RELOCATION FACILITIES

2 *For expenses necessary for the construction of reloca-*
 3 *tion facility projects protected against fallout, pursuant to*
 4 *the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), but sub-*
 5 *ject to approval of any such project by resolutions adopted*
 6 *by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House*
 7 *of Representatives, respectively, \$3,800,000, to remain avail-*
 8 *able until expended.*

9 OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

10 For necessary expenses of personal property manage-
 11 ment and related activities as authorized by law and not
 12 otherwise provided for, (46)\$3,716,500 \$4,240,000: *Pro-*
 13 *vided, That not to exceed \$3,243,500 of any funds received*
 14 *during the current or preceding fiscal year for deposit under*
 15 *section 204 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative*
 16 *Services Act of 1949, as amended, and not otherwise dis-*
 17 *posed of by law, shall be deposited to the credit of this ap-*
 18 *propriation and shall be available for necessary expenses in*
 19 *carrying out the functions of the General Services Admin-*
 20 *istration under the said Act, with respect to the utilization*
 21 *and disposal of excess and surplus personal property.*

22 EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

23 For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for
 24 operation of the stores depot system and other procurement

1 services, including contractual services incident to receiv-
2 ing, handling, and shipping warehouse items, \$22,950,000.

3 OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND
4 RECORDS SERVICE

5 For necessary expenses in connection with Federal rec-
6 ords management and related activities as provided by law,
7 including reimbursement for security guard services, and
8 contractual services incident to movement or disposal of
9 records, \$9,420,000.

10 OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC
11 UTILITIES SERVICE

12 For necessary expenses of transportation and public
13 utilities management and related activities, as provided by
14 law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the
15 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to
16 exceed \$75 per diem for individuals, \$2,375,000.

17 STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

18 For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions
19 of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50
20 U.S.C. 98-98b), during the current fiscal year, for trans-
21 portation and handling, within the United States (including
22 charges at United States ports), storage, security, and main-
23 tenance of strategic and critical materials acquired for or
24 transferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant

1 to section 104 (b) of the Agricultural Trade Development
 2 and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704 (b)), for carry-
 3 ing out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act
 4 of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462), relating to machine tools
 5 and industrial manufacturing equipment for which the Gen-
 6 eral Services Administration is responsible, including
 7 reimbursement for security guard services, services as au-
 8 thorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
 9 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed \$2,948,000 for operating
 10 expenses, \$30,000,000, with which shall be merged the
 11 unobligated balances of funds remaining available under this
 12 head on June 30, 1960: *Provided*, That no part of funds
 13 available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank
 14 storage facilities(47): *Provided further*, That during the cur-
 15 rent fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of sur-
 16 plus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with
 17 section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock
 18 Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(a)), may be transferred to stock-
 19 piles established in accordance with said Act: *Provided fur-*
 20 *ther*, That any receipts from sales (48)or otherwise during
 21 the current fiscal year shall be promptly deposited into the
 22 Treasury.

23 SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

24 For expenses of executive direction for activities under
 25 the control of the General Services Administration, \$240,000.

1 ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER

2 PRESIDENTS

3 For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August
4 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$250,000: *Provided*, That the
5 Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Sec-
6 retary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to
7 carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such
8 Act.

9 REFUNDS UNDER RENEGOTIATION ACT

10 For refunds under section 201 (f) of the Renegotiation
11 Act of 1951 (50 U.S.C. App. 1231 (f)), \$900,000, to
12 remain available until expended.

13 (49)WORKING CAPITAL FUND

14 *To increase the capital of the "Working capital fund"*
15 *established by the Act of May 3, 1945 (40 U.S.C. 293),*
16 *\$100,000.*

17 ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

18 Funds available to General Services Administration for
19 administrative operations, in support of program activities,
20 shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a
21 single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That
22 costs and obligations for such administrative operations for
23 the respective program activities shall be accounted for in
24 accordance with systems approved by the General Account-
25 ing Office: *Provided further*, That the total amount deposited

1 into said account for the fiscal year 1961 from funds made
2 available to General Services Administration in this Act
3 shall not exceed ~~(50)\$13,000,000~~ \$13,300,000: *Provided*
4 *further*, That amounts deposited into said account for admin-
5 istrative operations for each program shall not exceed the
6 amounts included in the respective program appropriations
7 for such purposes.

8 GENERAL PROVISIONS

9 The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the
10 General Services Administration shall be credited with (1)
11 cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair,
12 and improvement, included as part of rentals received from
13 Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129) ;
14 (2) reimbursements for services performed in respect to
15 bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the
16 General Services Administration, issued by public author-
17 ities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in
18 respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator
19 deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the
20 request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be pro-
21 vided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and
22 (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and
23 transferred to the General Services Administration, in con-
24 nection with property transferred to the General Services
25 Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50

1 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so
2 transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

3 Appropriations under the head "Construction, Public
4 Buildings Projects" shall be available for acquisition of
5 buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation or
6 otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, or
7 for other approved (51)extension and conversion projects
8 outside the District of Columbia.

9 Funds available to the General Services Administration
10 shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

11 No part of any money appropriated by this or any other
12 Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Govern-
13 ment shall be used during the current fiscal year for the pur-
14 chase within the continental limits of the United States of
15 any typewriting machines except in accordance with regula-
16 tions issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Prop-
17 erty and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

18 Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made
19 available to the General Services Administration for the cur-
20 rent fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other
21 such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be in-
22 creased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided*, That
23 such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and
24 shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$2,000,000.

1 Appropriations available to any department or agency
2 during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, in-
3 cluding maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be
4 available for reimbursement to the General Services Admin-
5 istration for those expenses of renovation and alteration of
6 buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements,
7 performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of
8 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law.

9 **(52)***In disposing of surplus real estate and buildings a*
10 *reasonable period of time shall be allowed for local govern-*
11 *mental units to perfect a comprehensive and coordinated plan*
12 *of use and procurement.*

13 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

14 OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

15 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

16 For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administra-
17 tor, including rent in the District of Columbia; services as
18 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
19 U.S.C. 55a) ; and purchase of two passenger motor vehicles
20 for replacement only; \$10,327,000: *Provided*, That neces-
21 sary expenses of inspections and of providing repre-
22 sentatives at the site of projects being planned or under-
23 taken by local public agencies pursuant to title I of the
24 Housing Act of 1949, as amended, projects financed through
25 loans to educational institutions authorized by title IV of the

1 Housing Act of 1950, as amended, and projects and facilities
2 financed by loans to public agencies pursuant to title II of
3 the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be
4 compensated by such agencies or institutions by the payment
5 of fixed fees which in the aggregate will cover the costs of
6 rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose shall
7 be considered nonadministrative; and for the purpose of pro-
8 viding such inspections, the Administrator may utilize any
9 agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or pay-
10 ment for such services from such institutions, or the Admin-
11 istrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropriations
12 or funds against which such charges have been made, but
13 such nonadministrative expenses shall not exceed \$2,900,000.

14 URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

15 For grants in accordance with the provisions of section
16 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, \$4,000,000.

17 RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS (PAYMENT TO 18 REVOLVING FUND)

19 For payment to the revolving fund established pur-
20 suant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as
21 amended (40 U.S.C. 462), \$6,000,000.

22 GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

23 For an additional amount for payment of grants as
24 authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended
25 (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), \$150,000,000.

1 HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY (PAYMENT TO REVOLVING
2 FUND)

3 For payment to the revolving fund established pursuant
4 to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, ~~(53)\$5,000,000~~
5 ~~\$50,000,000~~(54): *Provided, That of such amount not less*
6 *than \$150,000 shall be available, subject to the provisions of*
7 *such section 202, for a loan or loans for the provision of*
8 *housing and related facilities on any Indian reservation for*
9 *the benefit of elderly persons who are members of an Indian*
10 *tribe.*

11 PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

12 ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

13 For the payment of annual contributions to public hous-
14 ing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United
15 States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410),
16 \$140,000,000.

17 ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

18 For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Ad-
19 ministration, \$13,050,000, to be expended under the author-
20 ization for such expenses contained in title II of this Act.

21 INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

22 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

23 For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce
24 Commission, including not to exceed \$5,000 for the employ-

1 ment of special counsel; services as authorized by section
 2 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates
 3 not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals; and purchase of
 4 not to exceed thirty-three passenger motor vehicles of which
 5 twenty-seven shall be for replacement only; ~~(55)\$19,777,~~
 6 ~~000 \$20,500,000~~, of which not less than \$1,567,000 shall be
 7 available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety
 8 activities and not less than \$1,094,500 shall be available for
 9 expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection
 10 activities: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and co-
 11 operating State commissioners may use Government trans-
 12 portation requests when traveling in connection with their
 13 duties as such.

14 NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE

15 ADMINISTRATION

16 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

17 For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of
 18 the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, includ-
 19 ing hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed
 20 ~~(56)\$4,900,000~~ \$5,849,000 for expenses of travel; and uni-
 21 forms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of
 22 September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131);
 23 ~~(57)\$166,500,000~~ \$170,760,000.

1 RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

2 For contractual research, development, operations, tech-
 3 nical services, repairs, alterations, and minor construction,
 4 and for supplies, materials, and equipment necessary for the
 5 conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and
 6 development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space
 7 Administration; and purchase of ~~(58)~~forty-five *sixty* passen-
 8 ger motor vehicles, of which twenty-nine shall be for replace-
 9 ment only; ~~(59)~~\$602,240,000 \$671,453,000, to remain
 10 available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this
 11 appropriation shall be available for payment of salaries of
 12 National Aeronautics and Space Administration personnel. ~~Et~~

13 CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

14 For construction and equipment for the National Aero-
 15 nautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or
 16 condemnation of real property as authorized by law,
 17 ~~(60)~~\$107,275,000 \$122,787,000, to remain available until
 18 expended.

19 GENERAL PROVISIONS

20 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made
 21 available to the National Aeronautics and Space Adminis-
 22 tration by this Act may be transferred to any other such
 23 appropriation, but the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation
 24 shall not be thereby increased.

25 ~~(61)~~*Not to exceed \$20,000 of appropriations in this Act for*

1 *the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall*
 2 *be available for scientific consultations and any emergency*
 3 *or extraordinary expense pursuant to section 1(h) of the*
 4 *legislative authorization for appropriations for the fiscal year*
 5 *1961.*

6 (62) NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

7 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

8 For the operation and maintenance of properties under
 9 title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, \$40,-
 10 000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases,
 11 or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the
 12 United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so long as
 13 funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing
 14 purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act
 15 of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not
 16 be effective.

17 NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

18 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

19 For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the
 20 National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42
 21 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including award of graduate fellow-
 22 ships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of
 23 August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50
 24 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles;
 25 and reimbursement of the General Services Administration

1 for security guard services; ~~(63)\$160,000,000~~ \$191,600,-
 2 000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of
 3 the foregoing amount not less than \$30,250,000 shall be
 4 available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection
 5 with a program of supplementary training for secondary
 6 school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further*,
 7 That not to exceed \$1,600,000 of the foregoing appropria-
 8 tion may be used to purchase foreign currencies which ac-
 9 crue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development
 10 and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704),
 11 for the purposes authorized by section 104 (k) of that Act.

12 RENEGOTIATION BOARD

13 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

14 For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, in-
 15 cluding hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as
 16 authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5
 17 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for indi-
 18 viduals, \$2,870,000.

19 SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

20 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

21 For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allow-
 22 ances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and
 23 services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August
 24 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), ~~(64)\$8,525,000~~ \$9,300,000.

1 SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

2 SALARIES AND EXPENSES

3 For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title 4 I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 5 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by 6 section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); 7 purchase of eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement 8 only, including one at not to exceed \$4,000; not to exceed 9 \$61,536 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board; 10 and \$19,140 for the National Advisory Committee on the 11 Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists; (65) 12 ~~\$30,278,400~~ \$32,778,400: *Provided*, That during the cur- 13 rent fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation 14 from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the 15 Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such ac- 16 tion to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

18 VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

19 GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

20 For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Ad- 21 ministration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses 22 incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uni- 23 forms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; reim- 24 bursement of the General Services Administration for secu-

1 rity guard service; and not to exceed \$67,000 for preparation,
 2 shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic
 3 displays, moving pictures, and other visual education infor-
 4 mation and descriptive material, including purchase or
 5 rental of equipment; \$153,500,000: *Provided*, That no part
 6 of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-
 7 two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided fur-*
 8 *ther*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay
 9 educational institutions for reports and certifications of at-
 10 tendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess
 11 of \$1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and
 12 attending such institution.

13 MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS
 14 OPERATING EXPENSES

15 For expenses necessary for administration of the medical,
 16 hospital, domiciliary, special service, construction and supply,
 17 research, and employee education and training activities, and
 18 expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical re-
 19 search, as authorized by law, (66)~~\$30,000,000~~ \$39,000,000,
 20 of which (67)~~\$17,000,000~~ \$26,000,000 shall be available for
 21 medical research: *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 of the fore-
 22 going appropriations shall remain available until expended
 23 for prosthetic testing and development.

INPATIENT CARE

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration as authorized by law, including the furnishing of recreational articles and facilities; maintenance and operation of farms; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; purchase of ninety-four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State or Territorial homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38, United States Code, for the support of veterans eligible for admission to Veterans Administration facilities for hospital or domiciliary care; \$817,021,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That allotments and transfers may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them under the

1 various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such
2 amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of bene-
3 ficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

4 OUTPATIENT CARE

5 For expenses necessary for furnishing outpatient care to
6 beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, as authorized
7 by law; purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replace-
8 ment only; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as author-
9 ized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131) ; \$86,481,000.

10 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF SUPPLY DEPOTS

11 For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation
12 of supply depots, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as
13 authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131) , \$2,500,000.

14 COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

15 For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities,
16 and allowances (including burial awards authorized by sec-
17 tion 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence
18 allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under
19 any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based
20 thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and
21 annuities, the administration of which is now or may here-
22 after be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the
23 payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections
24 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended
25 \$3,800,000,000, to remain available until expended.

1 READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

2 For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans
3 as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment
4 Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and
5 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equip-
6 ment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38,
7 United States Code, \$344,000,000, to remain available
8 until expended.

9 VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

10 For military and naval insurance, for national service
11 life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-
12 disabled veterans insurance, \$48,800,000, to remain avail-
13 able until expended: *Provided*, That certain premiums pro-
14 vided by law to be credited to the "Military and naval
15 insurance" or "National service life insurance" appropria-
16 tions shall hereafter be credited to appropriations granted
17 under this head which shall be subject to the same statutory
18 provisions and shall be available for the same purpose as
19 formerly applied to the appropriations for "Military and naval
20 insurance", "National service life insurance", and "Service-
21 men's indemnities".

22 GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

23 For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants
24 in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United

1 States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treat-
2 ment of veterans, \$1,500,000.

3 CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY
4 FACILITIES

5 For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and
6 for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and ex-
7 tending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the
8 Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth
9 in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States
10 Code, \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended.

11 ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

12 Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for
13 the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions",
14 "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and in-
15 demnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned
16 appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the
17 appropriations so augmented.

18 Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration
19 for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall
20 be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the
21 Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for "Inpatient care" and "Outpatient care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards au-

1 thorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code),
2 for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving
3 care under such appropriations.

4 No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Vet-
5 erans Administration (except the appropriation for "Con-
6 struction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be
7 available for the purchase of any site for or toward the
8 construction of any new hospital or home.

9 No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be avail-
10 able for hospitalization or examination of any persons except
11 beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits
12 to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the
13 appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Adminis-
14 trator of Veterans Affairs.

15 INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

16 SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are ex-
17 pendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific
18 limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such
19 travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth there-
20 for in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations:
21 *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel per-
22 formed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal
23 boards of the Selective Service System, or to travel per-
24 formed in connection with the investigation of aircraft acci-
25 dents by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

1 SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this
2 title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling
3 a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held
4 by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of
5 the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period
6 of active military or naval service and has within
7 ninety days after his release from such service or from hospi-
8 talization continuing after discharge for a period of not more
9 than one year made application for restoration to his former
10 position and has been certified by the Civil Service Commis-
11 sion as still qualified to perform the duties of his former posi-
12 tion and has not been restored thereto.

13 SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available
14 by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase
15 or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new of-
16 fices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this
17 limitation shall not apply to programs which have been ap-
18 proved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

19 TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

20 The following corporations and agencies, respectively,
21 are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the
22 limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each
23 such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to
24 make such contracts and commitments without regard to
25 fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the

1 Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may
2 be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the
3 Budget for the fiscal year 1961 for each such corporation
4 or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

5 FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

6 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXAMINATION
7 EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

8 Not to exceed a total of \$1,943,000 shall be avail-
9 able for administrative expenses of the Federal Home
10 Loan Bank Board, and shall be derived from funds available
11 to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in
12 the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and
13 receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration,
14 the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home Loan
15 Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years,
16 and the Board may utilize and may make payment for
17 services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the
18 Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insur-
19 ance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government
20 (including payment for office space): *Provided*, That all
21 necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship
22 of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan
23 Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of pro-
24 ceedings under section 5 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan
25 Act of 1933 or section 407 of the National Housing Act and

1 all necessary expenses (including services performed on a
2 contract or fee basis, but not including other personal serv-
3 ices) in connection with the handling, including the pur-
4 chase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal
5 home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of,
6 or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the
7 Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be con-
8 sidered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes here-
9 of: *Provided further*, That hereafter expenses of the Board
10 in making studies or investigations specifically directed by
11 law, or requested by the Congress or either House thereof or
12 by a committee of either House, including services authorized
13 by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a),
14 shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses: *Provided*
15 *further*, That members and alternates of the Federal Savings
16 and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reimburse-
17 ment from the Board as approved by the Board for trans-
18 portation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of or
19 concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid
20 not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided*
21 *further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this
22 Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore speci-
23 fied, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the
24 Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance
25 with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of

1 July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449) : *Pro-*
 2 *vided further*, That the nonadministrative expenses for the
 3 examination of Federal and State chartered institutions
 4 (other than special examinations determined by the Board
 5 to be necessary) shall not exceed ~~(68)\$8,141,000~~
 6 ~~\$8,341,000~~.

7 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
 8 SAVINGS AND LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

9 Not to exceed ~~(69)\$787,500~~ \$800,000 shall be available
 10 for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual
 11 basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation,
 12 properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection
 13 with liquidation of insured institutions or preparation for
 14 or conduct of proceedings under section 407 of the National
 15 Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived
 16 from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action
 17 for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of
 18 losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and ex-
 19 penses, and payments for administrative expenses of the
 20 Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board
 21 to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said
 22 Corporation may utilize and may make payment for services
 23 and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal
 24 Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and
 25 other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwith-

1 standing any other provisions of this Act, except for the
2 limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administra-
3 tive expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall
4 be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV
5 of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724-
6 1730 (70)), and such other obligations of said corporation
7 shall not exceed \$887,800.

8 GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

9 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL 10 FACILITIES CORPORATION

11 Not to exceed \$20,000 shall be available during the
12 fiscal year 1961 for all administrative expenses of the
13 Corporation (including use of the services and facilities
14 of Federal Reserve banks), to be computed on an accrual
15 basis, and to be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, cap-
16 italized expenditures, expenses in connection with the
17 acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improve-
18 ment, or disposition of real or personal property belonging
19 to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, expenses
20 of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection
21 with the performance of legal services, and all administrative
22 expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECON-
2 STRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION LIQUIDATION
3 FUND

4 Not to exceed \$40,000 (to be computed on an accrual
5 basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of
6 Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General
7 Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1
8 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the cur-
9 rent fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the
10 liquidation of said functions: *Provided*, That as used herein
11 the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to
12 include all salaries and wages, services performed on a con-
13 tract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including
14 the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative
15 offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of services
16 performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the
17 termination of contracts or in the performance of legal
18 services: *Provided further*, That the distribution of adminis-
19 trative expenses to the account shall be made in accordance
20 with generally recognized accounting principles and prac-
21 tices.

1 HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

2 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
3 THE ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

4 Not to exceed ~~(71)\$1,260,000~~ \$1,400,000 shall be
5 available for all administrative expenses, which shall be on
6 an accrual basis, of carrying out the functions of the Admin-
7 istrator under the program of housing loans to educational
8 institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as
9 amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d), but this amount shall
10 be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the
11 Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Fed-
12 eral home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the
13 meaning of the Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance
14 Corporation (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12
15 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary
16 of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the
17 United States.

18 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
19 THE ADMINISTRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

20 Not to exceed ~~(72)\$477,000~~ \$530,000 of funds in the
21 revolving fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing
22 Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for ad-
23 ministrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of

1 payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve
2 banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan
3 banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act
4 creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of
5 August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has
6 been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a de-
7 pository of public money of the United States.

8 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF
9 THE ADMINISTRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDAT-
10 ING PROGRAMS)

11 During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$139,500
12 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this
13 amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case
14 of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Gov-
15 ernment and legal services on a contract or fee basis and
16 of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve
17 banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the
18 Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-
19 loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of
20 the Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Fed-
21 eral Deposit Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which
22 has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a
23 depository of public money of the United States.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
2 NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

3 Not to exceed \$6,550,000 shall be available for
4 administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual
5 basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses
6 (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed
7 on a contract or fee basis) in connection with the
8 issuance and servicing of securities, depreciation, properly
9 capitalized expenditures, fees for servicing mortgages, ex-
10 penses (including services performed on a force account,
11 contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal serv-
12 ices) in connection with the acquisition, protection, opera-
13 tion, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or
14 personal property belonging to said Association or in which
15 it has an interest, cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other
16 expenses of persons employed outside of the continental
17 United States, expenses of services performed on a contract
18 or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal serv-
19 ices, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other
20 Government agencies, and said Association may utilize and
21 may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal
22 Reserve banks and other agencies of the Government: *Pro-*
23 *vided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to
24 the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance
25 with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

1 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
 2 TIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRA-
 3 TION

4 For administrative expenses in carrying out duties im-
 5 posed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed ~~(73)~~\$8,450,000
 6 \$8,650,000 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Ad-
 7 ministration shall be available, in accordance with the Na-
 8 tional Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), includ-
 9 ing uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the
 10 Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131) :

11 *Provided*, That funds shall be available for contract actuarial
 12 services (not to exceed \$1,500) ~~(74)~~: ~~*Provided further*,~~
 13 That nonadministrative expenses of all kinds regardless of
 14 source classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved
 15 October 25, 1949, including all appraisal fees regardless of
 16 source or method of financing shall not exceed \$50,000,000:

17 *Provided further*, That nonadministrative expenses classified
 18 by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949,
 19 shall not exceed \$50,000,000 ~~(75)~~: *Provided further*, That in
 20 addition to the foregoing limitation, there may be apportioned
 21 for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as
 22 amended, such additional amounts (not exceeding in the ag-
 23 gregate 15 per centum of such limitation) as may be necessary
 24 to process workload in connection with mortgage insurance
 25 applications which the Commissioner may determine to be

1 *necessary to avoid undue inconvenience or hardship to the*
2 *housing industry and the public.*

3 LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRA-
4 TIVE EXPENSES, PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

5 Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such ex-
6 penses by title I of this Act shall be available for the
7 administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administra-
8 tion in carrying out the provisions of the United States
9 Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401-1433);
10 purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized
11 by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C.
12 2131); and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor
13 vehicle for replacement only: *Provided*, That necessary
14 expenses of providing representatives of the Administra-
15 tion at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with
16 the construction of such non-Federal projects by public
17 housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be
18 compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees
19 which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs
20 of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such serv-
21 ices, and expenditures by the Administration for such
22 purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and
23 funds received from such payments may be used only for
24 the payment of necessary expenses of providing representa-
25 tives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal

1 projects: *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public
2 Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act,
3 in carrying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed
4 \$1,200,000.

5 TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

6 SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in
7 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
8 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used
9 for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support
10 or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

11 SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in
12 this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any
13 corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to
14 pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel
15 work in excess of the number that would be provided by a
16 ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five,
17 or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent em-
18 ployees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided*,
19 That for purposes of this section employees shall be con-
20 sidered as engaged in personnel work if they spend half-
21 time or more in personnel administration consisting of
22 direction and administration of the personnel program;
23 employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and
24 classification; employee relations and services; (76) commit-
25 tees of expert examiners and boards of civil service exam-

1 ~~iners~~; wage administration; and processing, recording, and
2 reporting.

3 SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this
4 Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any cor-
5 poration or agency included in this Act, shall be used for
6 construction of fallout shelters in Government-owned or
7 leased buildings except where specifically provided.

8 This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices
9 Appropriation Act, 1961".

Passed the House of Representatives April 20, 1960.

Attest: RALPH R. ROBERTS,
Clerk.

Passed the Senate with amendments June 22, 1960.

Attest: FELTON M. JOHNSTON,
Secretary.

86TH CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 11776

AN ACT

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

JUNE 22, 1960

Ordered to be printed with the amendments of the
Senate numbered

"All other nations seem to have nearly reached their natural limits, and they have only to maintain their power; but these are still in the act of growth. All the others have stopped, or continue to advance with extreme difficulty; these alone are proceeding with ease and celerity along a path to which no limit can be perceived. The American struggles against the obstacles that nature opposes to him; the adversaries of the Russian are men. The former combats the wilderness and savage life; the latter, civilization with all its arms. The conquests of the Americans are therefore gained by the plowshare; those of the Russian by the sword. The Anglo-American relies upon personal interest to accomplish his ends and gives free scope to the unguided strength and commonsense of the people; the Russian centers all the authority of society in a single arm. The principal instrument of the former is freedom; of the latter, servitude. Their starting point is different and their courses are not the same; yet each of them seems marked out by the will of heaven to sway the destinies of half the globe."

Our instruction from this passage is incomplete unless we are patient enough to draw from it its more subtle lessons.

When Tocqueville viewed America, he found everywhere a restless energy, a faith in the country and its future, and an aggressive will of common men to make democracy work. None of the men he met were equal to the giants of our revolution and our constitutional convention, but they better prove the power of ideas because, as common men with an uncommon idea, they were ready to move the world.

Tocqueville's observations about the Russians are less easily understood. For 60 years, their vast territory and potential power were ineffective; but then they, too, were moved by an idea; it was in 1917 that the Communist idea became the controlling force in Russian national policy. Since that date history has been a test of strength between the idea of "76" and the idea of "17". At stake has been, and is, the future of our civilization. Since the contest is essentially between two ideas, it is obvious that it is the mind of man that is the critical resource in our present struggle. But in a more particular way, the issue is one of minds.

Tocqueville contrasted the United States and Russia by saying our conquests were gained by the plowshare; theirs by the sword. In a symbolic sense this observation was true and at the time useful. But the symbolism clouds our vision now, and tempts us toward a bucolic nostalgia when what we require is a rebirth of conviction that can support both effort and sacrifice.

Seen in retrospect, the cutting edge of our plowshare has been improved by an experimental industry that hardened the steel and sharpened the blade. It was multiplied to become a gang plow and attached to a diesel driven tractor. While implement manufacturers were adding seeders, combines, cotton pickers, and a host of almost human machines to the farmer's arsenal of conquest, plant geneticists were developing hybrids to increase yield and to resist plant infestation; and chemists were transforming corn and carbons into fuels and fabrics that nature had never contemplated. In the new symbolism, Tocqueville's plowshare must be replaced by the ferrule or the classroom, for the conquests of America have been made by education.

The central role of education in American progress is clearly seen by every foreign observer. In our recent visit in Latin America it was constantly stated as axiomatic that our material progress was the result of education; and that their material progress would depend upon their ability to imitate or improve upon our example. The King of Nepal visited our campus on the sixth

of May. When he spoke to our guests, his lead sentence was: "We need not tell you how important education is in making democracy more purposeful and meaningful, for your great country is an example of this meaning."

It is characteristic and good that we ask "Why Johnny can't read," for we cannot afford to be satisfied. But we have dwelt upon our faults, failing to notice that the rest of the world marvels that for every Johnny there are 99 of his friends that read very well. As a result, we have depreciated education and made our educators whipping boys while our neighbors have sought ways to emulate what our educators have done. Somehow we need to become big enough to be self-critical without becoming self-debasing. And perhaps a different view of Russia may help.

Tocqueville remarked that Russian conquests were made by the sword. This observation was also symbolic. And it may be remembered that for 70 years after Tocqueville, Russia's conquests were a precious few, and that in 1905 she was humiliated by a little known and unappreciated country, Japan. It was not until after the Communist revolution of 1917 that the Russian blade was tempered and sharpened for modern conquest. At that time the Leninist government seized control of a disorganized government, an underdeveloped economy, and an uneducated people. They thought of themselves as a peoples revolutionary government—as a 20th century parallel to our men of 1776. Quite naturally they studied our experiment to see what had made possible our success.

Initially the common Russian was not likely to deride our country, but rather asked the American traveler how our revolution was coming, as though 142 years made no difference, and we were still brother revolutionaries. Even the leaders of doctrinaire communism had great respect for our material achievements and carefully studied our methods. They soon recognized that the proximate cause of the amazing American achievement was education. And Russia learned this lesson well. She established 5-year plans for the Kulaks, and 8-year plans for heavy industry, but she began to organize a lifetime plan of education, on the assumption that without education all her other plans must fail.

The dreadful power of the Nazi invaders that swept into the Ukraine in World War II and pushed east to the Volga before they were stopped at Stalingrad destroyed Russia's best hydroelectrical installations, reduced her most highly developed industrial area to rubble, and blackened the fields and leveled the buildings in her most productive agricultural region. Russia's economic situation in 1945 was desperate. She could well have said, "We can afford no money or time for preparation now. Every Russian must produce today!" But Russia had been completely persuaded that U.S. progress had been the child of education. Her response to disaster was not, "We cannot afford education," but rather "Only education can restore us to a competitive position. No sacrifice is too great, and no other program so important that it should be permitted to interfere. We can afford nothing else until we afford education."

She did not quibble about tuition fees; rather, she paid her brightest students to go to college. Between 1945 and 1957 Russia refashioned her sword for conquest, shaped it for space flight, equipped it with an atomic warhead, powered it with rocket fuel, and made possible a thrust or parry at 9,000 miles; sent a sample to circle the sun; and this month announced that one sword can be carried undersea by nuclear engines, while another large enough to carry men patrols the immediate band of outer space.

This transformation of the Russian sword, like our earlier transformation of the plowshare, has been done with the sliderule and the classroom. Today Russia's real instrument of conquest, which Tocqueville symbolized as a sword, is education.

If, therefore, we return to the historian with the penchant for classification, we may well say, "This is not the age of the United States, nor of Russia, nor the nuclear age, nor the atomic age, but rather the age of education." The angry threats of Khrushchev as he left Paris should remind us that today we can leave nothing to chance; nor can we depend on good will or the ameliorating force of natural human kindness. The present international climate is cold indeed. And we must prepare ourselves against the most grim possibilities. When we arrange for historical classification we may talk as though this were the age of education, but we must act as though it were the final hour. And we should recognize that we will never again be in a position to afford anything if we do not afford education now.

My preoccupation with international affairs is born of our present crises. However, there are other considerations that require the same prescription. This fall Oregon will present to its private and public colleges 12 percent more candidates than last year. We are entering the baby boom era. On occasions we may have tired our listeners with warnings about the capital costs and instruction costs attendant on this sudden expansion.

For the moment, therefore, consider this population explosion as a sociologic rather than an educational issue. When the students in the enlarged graduating classes walk away from high school this spring, where will they make good their commencement? What or whose jobs will they take? When the numbers have doubled (1970), will those who are given no additional training be carrying their weight or being carried? For a generation we have experienced an increase in adolescent crime. Our folkways tell us idle hands are the devil's workshop. Our experience tells us that an unoccupied mind gathers trash more quickly than classics, and that both good literature and good music are educated tastes.

If you do not face the issue of costs and provide a welcome at college for these increasing numbers, where will you entertain them? How will you finance the men who must watch them on street corners, or feed them in the additional McLaren and Hillcrest schools that we will require?

Perhaps we should reexamine our assumptions about what a society can afford. Certainly so long as we live we can afford what is necessary to survive; and this requires defense; and defense is education. But a country as well developed as ours should require more of life. We should also ask that the life we have be worth living. That would imply that the leisure hours, those beyond the 40- or 35-hour workweek, be worthy of rational men.

At this point we return to first principles and the language of our Founding Fathers. We require more than life. We require liberty and the pursuit of happiness. The first of these requires wise men, for liberty is possible only among men of sound judgment and good will. We may be born free, but we are not born wise. And the freedom with which we are born is the first casualty in a society that chooses to be ignorant. The second, the pursuit of happiness, cannot be confused with the cheap satisfaction of appetites or the idle titillation of our animal sensations.

Yet we seem dangerously bent on a life of pleasure which would make a mockery of our early high hopes. Happiness is born of achievement and is inextricably bound up

with satisfactions of the mind. The pursuit of happiness from which a proud culture might emerge, depends upon man seeing the mind as that part of God's image which is born in him, as that feature which alone separates him from the rest of the animal kingdom. It is man's mind that distinguishes him as human; intellectual satisfaction is at the core of human happiness. It was this happiness that Jefferson expected us to pursue; its pursuit is the best guarantee that life will be constructive; that delinquency will be avoided. Such happiness is the product of a cultivated mind. It, too, requires education.

Much the same case could be made for Oregon in economic development as the King of Nepal has made for his kingdom. Oregon's economy is still in the process of development. Her day is in the future. Our Governor, at the university assembly on May 10, wisely identified Oregon's economy with her educational effort.

When a university is obligated to acquire a new man or to replace an old one, there is an inescapable financial obligation. The fixed figure required to fill the place with an ordinary man would be 80 to 90 percent of the cost required to fill the post with a man of distinction. The ordinary man is not nationally visible, nor does he have leverage on national foundations or other granting agencies. The experience of the university has been that expenditure of additional funds to assure quality personnel in teaching posts, when made in critical areas, has actually brought more money into the State than would be necessary to pay the additional costs of quality.

As an example, five men appointed at the university in the last 3 years were replacements or additions for whom the fixed budget item would have totaled approximately \$10,000 less than we determined to pay in order to bring distinguished people to critical areas. Each of these men brought large teaching, research and training grants to the campus; one alone bringing over \$500,000 worth of grants in a period of less than 18 months. Their effect on the remainder of the staff and the growing interest in research increased university grants from approximately \$300,000 annually to \$1,500,000 in the past year. This last figure excludes certain fixed income which makes the audited program supported by external funds in excess of \$2 million.

The investment in quality, in other words, was not an expense but a distinct advantage to the State of Oregon measured only in money. A much more important consequence of search for quality in critical areas is the assurance that our young men and women are stimulated and inspired by brilliant minds. Their own appreciation of what is possible is expanded, and your and my expectation from them can be increased. The difference in the costs of run-of-the-mill and distinguished education is very small and the rewards are tremendous.

But Oregon's social, economic, and cultural development, as well as her security, are tightly bound to our national welfare. And our strength and vitality in each of these areas depends on how well we prepare the minds of our people. Ours is the age of education. We live in an hour of decision. We are engaged in a race not only between us and Russia, but also between education and disaster. Herein lies the full meaning of our discussion of colleges for Oregon's future.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions,

corporations, agencies, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the first committee amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The first committee amendment was, on page 2, line 12, after "functions;" to insert "not to exceed \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive;"

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the independent offices appropriation bill for 1961, H.R. 11776, contains funds for the regulatory commissions as well as for the Office of Civil Defense and Defense Mobilization, Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Aviation Agency, General Services Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency with its related corporations, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, National Science Foundation, Selective Service System, and the Veterans' Administration.

As reported to the Senate, the bill totals \$8,414,412,900, which is \$232,345,500 over the House and \$2,984,100 under the budget estimates.

The largest increase over the House is for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, of \$88,985,000, which restores \$915 million as budgeted for this important work, and in addition adds \$50 million over the budget estimate for the additional amount authorized by the Space Committee for research and development.

The next largest increase over the House is for the Federal Aviation Agency, of \$37,138,000, which includes \$21,500,000 for new air navigation facilities and \$15,638,000 to assure the operation of newly constructed facilities.

The third largest increase over the House is for the General Services Administration, of \$34,517,500, which provides for new public buildings construction and for operation and maintenance of presently owned buildings and leased space.

Part of this is for projects Nos. 8, 9, and 10, in the District of Columbia.

The next largest increase over the House is for the National Science Foundation, of \$31,600,000, which restores the amounts needed for the support of basic research and scientific manpower.

One further item in which the committee exceeded the budget estimates is for medical research in the Veterans' Administration, where \$9 million is added to provide medical research of \$26 million.

I wish to point out that for the first time in Veterans' Administration fiscal history, since I have been handling this bill, which has been for many years, medical care for veterans in the United States has reached a sum of more than \$1 billion. It is going up steadily because of the time element involved. Veterans of World War II are reaching the age where they need more medical care. The committee thought that the results

from previous funds voted in this field have been very beneficial. The committee also thought that with this staggering bill for the taxpayers to pay, and the fact that research in the past has paid off substantially in the medical plan, the sum of \$26 million for research in some fields of medical care was a very small amount with which to undertake such medical research.

Secondly, in the field of mental health, where we have had some fine results, both in the Health Institutes and in VA, we still find this year, as we found last year, that every other bed in the 173 veterans' hospitals in the United States is devoted to a mental case. The number is going up. That is why we added this amount, because when we have added these funds they have paid off, not only in dividends of alleviating human suffering and of mental care, but also in dollars and cents.

Mr. JAVITS. - Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. When I appeared before the committee I made the point about the Northport, Long Island, Veterans Hospital, of which, I know, the Senator has heard a great deal. It is one of the largest neuropsychiatric hospitals in the Veterans' Administration system. It is located at Northport, Long Island. It is greatly overcrowded. We have the word of the area medical director at Boston, Francis B. Carroll, in substantiation of that statement. I laid the facts before the committee. My statement is found at page 612 of the committee hearings.

I know that the chairman is just as much interested in veterans as I am, and I am making no invidious implications of any kind. I should like to ask the chairman whether or not we may hope that the committee will cause its staff to take a long, hard look at this situation in order to see whether the Veterans' Administration should not be stirred into doing something about it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree with the Senator from New York. I know how much interested he has been in this subject. There is no question at all about the conditions at Northport. There is no question about the tremendous increase in mental health cases—NP cases, as we call them—in the Veterans' Administration hospitals.

The Veterans' Administration last year set up what it calls a 12-year program for veterans' hospitals such as the one at Northport. Every year we are trying to get about one-twelfth of that program into operation. We can do only so much every year. We are behind in this activity. This year the priorities dictated that in that program we proceed with the hospital at Martinez, Calif., where there is a badly overcrowded condition, and also with the Cleveland hospital. Then there is also the one at Washington, D.C., which was supposed to have been located at Rockville, but was moved to the Soldiers' Home. Those are in the program this year. I would glean from the testimony that the hospital on Long Island would be included in the next fiscal year program. I be-

lieve that in the budget which will be submitted in September, this item will be one of the first included.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to the Senator.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I know the Senator's interest in this matter. In the hearings, at page 717, there is a table of the Veterans' Administration hospitals or facilities which are included in the modernization program. Included is the modernization program, phase 3, at Fort Meade, S. Dak. I should like to ask whether the bill as reported embraces that table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; it is embraced in the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This continues the program that was undertaken under phases 1 and 2. It completes the program. In this way, one of the best NP hospitals is being created. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee added \$12 million under the OCDM for matching funds with State and local organizations on civil defense to cover personnel and administrative expenses. Senators are familiar with this item. We have added it to the bill on three or four occasions. The House has always voted against the program. We have voted for it again, and we expect to go to conference on it. That is what we will have to do again. It includes matching funds. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and I, who heard all the testimony, have not changed our mind from last year. We believe if we are to have a civil defense program, local participation is the guts, so to speak, of a good program. The bill is still under the total budget estimate. As Senators know, although the total amount of the bill is somewhat staggering—\$8,414 million—the bulk of it is for the Veterans' Administration and the space program and the General Services Administration, which is a big organization now; it needs more money every year. It is not added money, because the administration has been assuming more responsibility every year.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator knows that I am very much interested in this program. My Governor, Governor Rockefeller, can be truly described as taking a very leading position in this field. I know how the Senator from Washington feels about it. I know that I do not have to back up his courage in this particular field in the negotiations in conference, because he has expressed himself very strongly before. I would rather say that I am grateful to the Senator from Washington, and I think it indicates that, although the Senator knows that this is a great deal of trouble in conference, he nevertheless is so convinced of the soundness of the program that he is willing to try again.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There may be some waste in the program on the Federal level. I do not know, of course. However, surely if the program is to be

a success, the local people must participate. The Senator from Colorado, I am sure, agrees with me on that point.

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator will yield, I should like to say that I do feel the same way. Members of the Appropriations Committee, particularly the Senator from Florida, have expressed themselves over and over again very strongly on this point. So far as I know, at least from listening to the members of the Appropriations Committee, there is not a member who does not feel exactly as the chairman and the Senator from Florida feel about it. We are faced with a responsibility for a civil defense program. All of us feel that the only way we can make it a meaningful program is to bring it down to the local level. We have tried that several times. We tried last year. We expect to try again this year, without any diminution in determination. We are more convinced than ever, after another year's experience, that the only way to have a successful civil defense program is to bring it down to the local level.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall defer to the Senator from Florida. It seems to me that the U-2 incident, the cancellation of the Tokyo visit, the blowup of the summit conference in Paris, should certainly add tremendous arguments to the position taken by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I know they will use those arguments to the full. What has been called atomic blackmail is now being rather openly and blatantly used; certainly civil defense is one of the greatest morale answers to it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am grateful to the Senator from New York. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I regret that I have a "bug," and that I may not be able to speak loud enough to be heard.

First, I think we all owe a debt to the Senator from Washington for his continued able leadership in this field. I am sorry the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is not in the Chamber. I heard his remarks aimed at this program but a couple of hours ago. I thought the most intriguing part in it was his statement that if a great disaster occurred, hundreds of thousands of volunteers would turn out, as they always have. The very gist of the matter is that unless there is someone to give some training, someone who knows what to do, and to have supplies ready in appropriate places, and to have such volunteers, who, of course, will be the body of workers in such a case, to have them trained and organized there will be disorganized mob action, instead of the highly skilled action which is required.

I certainly support the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to add my support to the chairman and to the senior Republican member of the committee on the question of Federal contributions for civil defense. Although we have gone forward every year a number of years and provided

funds, the House has resisted our action. I believe this is one of the items for which we should make provision in these difficult times. I hope that it will be possible to maintain the item in the House this year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since I am speaking in such a handicapped condition, I wonder if the distinguished Senator from Washington will let me take up another matter.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Certainly.

Mr. HOLLAND. The largely increased level of payments to subsidized air carriers was a matter of great concern to the committee, as the distinguished Senator from Washington knows. The committee dealing with this subject placed in the report, at the bottom of page 3, under the heading "Payments to Air Carriers," a statement of the committee's opinion on this subject. I feel strongly that Congress needs greater cooperation from the CAB in this matter. Too much granting of flights for feeder carriers which could not possibly carry the expense, much less make a profit, has been the rule in recent years. I think the Senate will find that sentiment very well expressed in the report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the section of the report to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the section was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS

LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION

Restoration of \$8,984,000 is recommended by the committee, to provide the full budget estimate of \$68,984,000 for payments to air carriers.

The committee continues to be concerned over the level of payments to air carriers; \$68,984,000 is provided for payments to air carriers for fiscal 1961 and the Board has testified that over \$81 million in carrier payments may in fact accrue.

The committee urges the Board to exert every effort to reverse the trend of increased subsidy. Where feasible, the Board should expedite suspension of trunkline carriers in local service-type markets, freeing the local service carriers from trunk competition, and should insert local service carriers into markets which would be profitable for them but which trunk carriers seek to abandon. To the extent possible, the Board should avoid duplication between subsidized local service carriers; also, to keep to a minimum those local service routes that cannot possibly be made to pay.

The committee believes that a most important contribution to reducing subsidy would be for the Board to permit local service carriers greater flexibility in operations in their assigned markets, permitting them to adjust their operations more freely to traffic volume.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to amplify the statement in the report by the further statement that the recommendation in the report is not intended as an approval of terminal-to-terminal nonstop operations by local carriers in direct competition with unsubsidized trunklines. The result of any such misinterpretation would be that the local carriers would put their energies into such markets instead of into the local markets they were created to serve. In my judgment, the Board has been too generous in its granting of routes

to local service carriers where there is no prospect of their being able to operate profitably. This is reflected dramatically in the figures given the Appropriations Committee in support of the budget request for subsidies. Estimated subsidy accruals for local service operations rose from \$22,567,718 in 1955 to an estimated \$37,504,832 for 1959. What is more dismaying, the estimated accruals for 1960 and 1961, respectively, are \$49,771,000 and \$55,434,000.

Mr. President, it is very evident that the feeder carrier subsidy has gotten clear out of hand. I hope that both the Civil Aeronautics Board and the aviation industry will give attention and strong consideration to our report, which I have sought to supplement at this time.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida has hit this matter on the head. It has been called to the attention of the Civil Aeronautics Board several times that perhaps they were not paying enough attention to the gist, the real purpose, of why they exist, and were involving themselves in extraneous activities.

As the report shows, and as the particular paragraph which the Senator from Florida has placed in the RECORD shows, the Board transferred from carrier relations, and specially stressed this year an increased budget.

With respect to the overall appropriation for subsidies, I think we feel, for the most part, that the Board has moved too slowly in trying to cut it down.

The committee, I feel, wants local companies to have small and big cities themselves, and does not want trunklines in cities where they provide only one or two flights a day, or carry relatively few passengers.

The Board, it seems to me, should stop considering the hairline details of these cases and get at its business.

This brings up the general question with respect to all the agencies which are confronted with bigger and bigger backlogs. We provide more and more personnel each year, and still each year they show a bigger backlog. It seems to me that what we should do is to try to get them, fundamentally, to look at their own procedures, to see if they cannot get back to doing the things which have to be done, so as to clear up the backlogs which exist in every one of the agencies.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, before discussing some of the amendments to the bill, I wish to express my deep appreciation for the help of all members of the subcommittee on the bill. As members of the Committee on Appropriations know, this is a long and difficult bill to consider. It includes many agencies and requires the hearing of complicated testimony and figures. All members of the committee worked diligently on the bill. We heard hundreds of witnesses. The bill includes funds for all the independent agencies of the Government.

I express appreciation for the help of all members of the committee during the

long hearings and the marking up of the bill.

I express, on behalf of the committee, appreciation to Mr. Earl Cooper, our very efficient staff member, who handles the bill in the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The chairman will recall that several weeks ago a delegation of mayors and presidents of railroads came before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, asking for relief by way of subsidies or loans at a low rate of interest.

At that time one of them testified to the huge subsidies, on a comparative basis, which were granted to the operators of helicopters. I notice on page 73 of the hearings that there is a discussion of the amount of money Congress has paid out in subsidies for that operation.

What are the indications as to whether the helicopter operations might become self-sustaining? Or is it likely, from all appearances, that the operation will require a permanent subsidy? The figures on page 73 of the hearings indicate that the Government paid the operators of helicopters \$4,613,000 in 1960, and \$4,858,000 in 1959.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The committee asked the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the other members of the Board present, a great deal about helicopter operations, along the lines suggested by the Senator from Ohio. The Chairman of the Board pointed out that the subsidy is in about the same amount this year as it was last year and the year before, but that the helicopter operators were providing more service; their operations were bigger. Therefore, we might assume that their operations were becoming more profitable.

Frankly, I do not see much in his testimony, from what he said to us, which will make it more profitable if they continue the type of operation they have in three places. It will be difficult to eliminate the subsidy, since they are now getting new equipment in order to be able to carry more passengers.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Washington may recall that the representatives who appeared before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce argued vigorously against the folly of expending large sums of money to provide helicopter service for a few passengers, when we were failing to do anything to aid those who provide mass transportation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct.

In the past 3 years there have been many applications for helicopter operations, but the Board has turned them down. I think some have come from Washington, D.C. These three have been allowed to operate in the three congested centers—namely, Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles.

But surely what the Senator from Ohio has said is absolutely correct—namely, that we should first be thinking of the larger problem. For instance, the

airport at Chantilly, Va., will be finished and ready for operation on July 1, 1961. Instead of thinking in terms of helicopter service around Washington, we should be thinking in terms of providing increased means of ingress and egress to the Chantilly airport, so we would not need helicopter service.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes.

I note that at the hearing the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] asked questions about this matter, and I believe, indicated his doubts about the propriety of what we were doing in this field.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. My recollection of the testimony of the Board on the helicopter service is that it still is maintained in only three places. It was initiated originally for the primary purpose of finding out how workable it was, with the idea that the air transportation development in this country was such that we would have to utilize helicopter service.

I know that when it was first begun, I was interested in it, as regards my own State. And I was told they would offer it in three places. They have now tried it for 3 or 4 years, I believe; have they not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. In Los Angeles it has been going on for 6 or 7 years; but we have had it for approximately a 4- or 5-year period.

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes, for a 4-year or 5-year period. As I recall the figures, it has not been shown that they have come any closer to finding ways and means to put it on a paying or an unsubsidized basis. All they promised, as I recall, or held out as a hope was that new developments in regard to the type of helicopter might come close to making it feasible.

I believe there is a limit to what we can do in providing this service.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The fact is that three services are operating—in New York, in Chicago, and in Los Angeles. According to the report made at the hearings, we paid them \$4,858,000 in 1959, to keep them solvent. That figure appears on page 73 of the hearings.

Mr. ALLOTT. I believe the figure the Senator from Ohio has quoted is correct. At that point in the hearing I said:

So that it would be safe to say, as we now look at the helicopter picture, that it will not be expanded to any other cities, but that the three cities—Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York—are for practical purposes on a continuing subsidy basis.

Mr. GILLILLAND. I believe that New York Airways, perhaps some others, are considering some new types of equipment that we are hopeful will make some change in their requirements, so that they will be able to show a downturn.

I believe that the Appropriations Committee or the legislative committee some time soon will have to take a hard look at this matter and decide whether the

possibilities are such that it should be continued.

Mr. LAUSCHE. From the questions put by the Senator from Colorado, I judge that he is skeptical that this program of delivering passengers from the airports to the downtown cities will become financially self-sustaining.

Mr. ALLOTT. That probably correctly describes my state of mind at the moment, yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the bill be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall be considered to have been waived by reason of this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 12, after the word "functions", to insert "not to exceed \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive"; in line 16, after the word "travel", to strike out "\$24,700,000" and insert "\$25,200,000"; in line 17, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out the comma and "of which \$185,000 shall be available for the Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Committee: *Provided*, That one contract for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), for not to exceed one person, may be renewed annually at a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75", and in line 22, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That contracts for not to exceed four persons under this appropriation for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be renewed annually, and one such contract, for the services of an expert or consultant for telecommunications, may provide for a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75."

On page 3, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "\$10,000,000" and insert "\$22,000,000"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "of which none shall be allocated to the States pursuant to section 205 of said Act" and insert "of which not to exceed \$12,000,000 shall be available for allocation to the States pursuant to section 205 of said Act", and in line 21, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That expenditures heretofore made under this appropriation head in reliance upon a certification of the appropriate State official for obligations incurred or expenditures made by a State or subdivision thereof prior to the availability of the applicable Federal appropriation are hereby ratified and confirmed if otherwise proper."

On page 4, line 9, to strike out "\$6,950,000" and insert "\$11,400,000".

On page 5, line 11, after the word "diem", to strike out "\$7,285,000" and insert "\$7,500,000".

On page 5, line 17, after the word "Board", to strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert "\$68,984,000".

On page 6, line 10, after the word "amended", to strike out "\$19,230,000" and insert "\$19,580,000".

On page 6, line 21, after the word "States", to insert a comma and "and the Act of August 28, 1938 (49 Stat. 956), as amended

by the Act of August 27, 1951 (65 Stat. 198), is hereby repealed".

On page 9, line 22, after the word "snowshoes", to strike out "\$365,245,000" and insert "\$380,883,000".

On page 10, line 13, after the word "of", to strike out "five" and insert "seven", and in line 17, after the word "appropriation", to strike out "\$152,500,000" and insert "\$174,000,000".

On page 13, line 8, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to insert "not to exceed \$172,000 for expenses of travel", and at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "\$12,935,000" and insert "\$13,135,000".

On page 13, line 19, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "\$7,532,000" and insert "\$7,795,000", and in line 23, after the word "individuals", to insert a colon and "*Provided*, That the Commission is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but without regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, to place six General Schedule positions in the following grades: four in grade GS-18, one in grade GS-17, and one in grade GS-16; and such positions shall be in addition to positions previously allocated to this agency under section 505 of said Act."

On page 14, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "\$7,415,000" and insert "\$7,600,000".

On page 15, line 13, after "(40 U.S.C. 521)", to strike out "\$160,850,000" and insert "\$169,300,000".

On page 16, line 10, after the word "For", to insert "an additional amount for"; in line 15, after the word "buildings", to strike out "\$144,836,000" and insert "\$171,980,000", and in line 18, after the word "projects", to insert "subject to approval of any such project by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively,".

On page 16, line 24, after the word "Arkansas", to strike out "\$633,250" and insert "\$655,050".

On page 17, line 2, after the word "California", to strike out "\$37,286,100" and insert "\$38,296,900".

On page 17, line 4, after the word "Connecticut", to strike out "\$7,636,400" and insert "\$7,816,400".

On page 17, line 7, to strike out "\$1,094,000" and insert "\$1,119,600".

On page 17, line 9, after the word "Maine", to strike out "\$284,750" and insert "\$297,550".

On page 17, line 10, after the word "Maine", to strike out "\$254,150" and insert "\$261,150".

On page 17, line 12, after the word "Michigan", to strike out "\$874,650" and insert "\$895,050".

On page 17, line 14, after the word "Montana", to strike out "\$586,500" and insert "\$615,600".

On page 17, line 19, to strike out "\$3,224,050" and insert "\$3,283,050".

On page 17, line 20, after the word "Ohio", to strike out "\$3,867,700" and insert "\$3,980,700".

On page 18, line 2, after the word "Tennessee", to strike out "\$9,587,150" and insert "\$10,167,150".

On page 18, line 5, after the word "Washington", to strike out "\$282,200" and insert "\$288,700".

On page 18, after line 5, to insert: "Federal Office Building Numbered Eight, District of Columbia, exclusive of laboratory and other equipment, \$15,794,000;"

On page 18, after line 8, to insert: "Federal Office Building Numbered Nine, District of Columbia, \$21,222,100;"

On page 18, after line 10, to insert: "Federal Office Building Numbered Ten, District of Columbia, \$40,803,500; and"

On page 18, after line 12, to insert "United States Court of Claims and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals building, \$6,491,000"; in

line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "5" and insert "10", and in the same line, after the words "per centum", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,500,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used for clearing the site and installing footings for the authorized public building project at Chicago, Illinois."

On page 19, line 2, after the word "otherwise", to strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$19,500,000", and in line 3, after the word "expended", to strike out the colon and "*Provided*, That not to exceed \$5,500,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used for clearing the site and installing footings for the authorized public building project at Chicago, Illinois."

On page 19, after line 6, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION, FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING NUMBERED 7, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"The appropriation contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the head 'Construction, United States Court of Claims and Federal Office Building, Washington, District of Columbia' is hereby made available for expenses necessary for the preparation of plans and specifications for a building in Washington, District of Columbia, for use of agencies of the executive branch of the Government without provision of space for the United States Court of Claims."

On page 19, after line 22, to insert:

"CONSTRUCTION OF RELOCATION FACILITIES

"For expenses necessary for the construction of relocation facility projects protected against fallout, pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), but subject to approval of any such project by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, \$3,800,000, to remain available until expended."

On page 20, line 9, after the word "for", to strike out "\$3,716,500" and insert "\$4,240,000".

On page 22, line 13, after the word "facilities", to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(a)), may be transferred to stockpiles established in accordance with said Act", and in line 19, after the word "sales", to strike out "or otherwise".

On page 23, after line 12, to insert:

"WORKING CAPITAL FUND

"To increase the capital of the 'Working capital fund' established by the Act of May 3, 1945 (40 U.S.C. 293), \$100,000."

On page 24, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$13,000,000" and insert "\$13,300,000".

On page 25, line 9, after the word "approved", to strike out "extension and conversion".

On page 26, after line 11, to insert:

"General Services Administration shall not construct any office building for any civilian agency or any Government-owned or partially owned corporation except Federal Reserve banks, nor shall any civilian agency or Government-owned or partially owned corporation, except the Federal Reserve banks, build any office building until the office building has been authorized by the Congress or its proper committees."

On page 26, after line 19, to insert:

"In disposing of surplus real estate and buildings a reasonable period of time shall be allowed for local governmental units to perfect a comprehensive and coordinated plan of use and procurement."

On page 29, line 15, after the word "only", to strike out "\$19,777,000" and insert "\$20,500,000".

On page 30, line 6, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$4,900,000" and insert "\$5,849,000", and in line 9, after "(5 U.S.C. 2131)", to strike out "\$166,500,000" and insert "\$170,760,000".

On page 30, line 17, after the word "of", to strike out "forty-five" and insert "sixty", and in line 19, after the word "only", to strike out "\$602,240,000" and insert "\$671,453,000".

On page 31, line 1, after the word "law", to strike out "\$107,275,000" and insert "\$122,787,000".

On page 31, after line 8, to insert:
 "Not to exceed \$20,000 of appropriations in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations and any emergency or extraordinary expense pursuant to section 1(f) of the legislative authorization for appropriations for the fiscal year 1961."

On page 31, after line 14, to strike out:
 "NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY
 "Operation and maintenance of properties

"For the operation and maintenance of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, \$40,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not be effective."

On page 32, line 12, after the word "services", to strike out "\$160,000,000" and insert "\$191,600,000".

On page 33, line 13, after "(5 U.S.C. 55a)", to strike out "\$8,525,000" and insert "\$9,300,000".

On page 34, at the beginning of line 4, to strike out "\$30,278,400" and insert "\$32,778,400".

On page 35, line 9, after the word "law", to strike out "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$39,000,000", and in line 10, after the word "which", to strike out "\$17,000,000" and insert "\$26,000,000".

On page 43, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$8,141,000" and insert "\$8,341,000".

On page 43, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$787,500" and insert "\$800,000", and on page 44, line 18, after "12 U.S.C. 1724-1730)", to strike out the comma and "and such other obligations of said corporation shall not exceed \$887,800".

On page 46, line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$1,260,000" and insert "\$1,400,000".

On page 47, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$477,000" and insert "\$530,000".

On page 49, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$8,450,000" and insert "\$8,650,000"; in line 19, after "(not to exceed \$1,500)", to strike out "*Provided further*, That nonadministrative expenses of all kinds regardless of source classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, including all appraisal fees regardless of source or method of financing shall not exceed \$50,000,000" and, in lieu thereof, to insert "*Provided further*, That nonadministrative expenses classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, approved October 25, 1949, shall not exceed \$50,000,000", and on page 50, line 1, after the amendment just above stated, to insert a colon and "*Provided further*, That in addition to the foregoing limitation, there may be apportioned for use, pursuant to section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, such additional amounts (not exceeding in the aggregate 15 per centum of such limitation) as may be necessary to process workload in connection with mortgage insurance applications which the Commissioner may determine to be necessary to avoid undue inconvenience of hardship to the housing industry and the public."

On page 52, line 6, after the word "services", to strike out "committees of expert examiners and boards of civil service examiners;"

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I send to the desk a point of order statement which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order submitted by the Senator from Indiana will be read.

The legislative clerk read the point of order, as follows:

I make a point of order against the language appearing in lines 12 through 19 on page 26, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Chair rule on the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair sustains the point of order made by the Senator from Indiana. The language does interfere with the powers of the agency.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, another Senator was talking to me in regard to another point in the bill. The point of order relates to the General Services Administration building matter, does it?

Mr. CAPEHART. Yes; and the Presiding Officer has ruled that that provision in the bill is legislation on an appropriation bill, and has sustained my point of order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. All right.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, although I do not quarrel with the Chair's ruling on the point of order, I think this matter should not be permitted to pass without calling attention to what the committee was trying to do. Certainly, it was no idle gesture.

The fact is that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which is set up for the purpose of insurance of the banks in this country, has already made plans to construct a building downtown. The chairman of the committee [Mr. MAGNUSON] asked the agency, as did I, about this item.

Mr. Coburn said:

Mr. COBURN. Our files show that since 1940 there have been various considerations given to the authority of the Corporation to build. Mr. Crowley, the original Chairman, had it in 1940. The records show that counsel then advised that the Corporation had the right and implied authority to build a building. There was a bill, I think, in 1950. Our legal files show that the principal reason the Corporation came to Congress at that time was to avoid a provision in our present act which says that the Corporation is exempt from all taxes except local real estate taxes. The bill was to avoid the local District real estate tax. At the present time we have decided that it would be appropriate for the Corporation to pay the tax to the District, and, therefore, we see no necessity for asking for legislation.

Let me ask whether the Senator from Washington recalls the amount that was proposed to be spent for construction of the building.

Mr. MAGNUSON. \$11,500,000, I believe.

Mr. ALLOTT. Both the Senator from Washington and I questioned them at some length, in connection with the type of building they proposed to construct. But we could not escape the fact that

this corporation is a Government Corporation. It may call the money it uses its own money, but it is not its own money. Under a law enacted by Congress—and I believe it is a good law—the banks of the country are required to pay money into the FDIC, to secure the funds of the depositors. No one quarrels with that; it is good legislation. But when Congress places that burden on the banks, Congress is also in a trust position.

In this appropriation bill, we appropriate funds to support the FDIC. I wish to call this matter to the particular attention of my friend, the Senator from Indiana, because I think it is wrong, after Congress appropriates money to support an agency, to permit the agency to say blithely, "We get our money from our depositors all over the country, and therefore we can build any building we please."

I do not agree; and I certainly intend to call this matter to the attention of the appropriate committee, next year, so that agencies which are dependent on the Government for support, and are using the taxes that are paid by the American people, will not be able to say, "We can build any sort of building for ourselves that we want—either lush or not lush; we can do as we please, according to what we, ourselves, decide."

Certainly that is wrong, and I intend to oppose it vigorously. This is a principle which I think should be brought out on the floor and put before the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ALLOTT. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. I have no quarrel with the idea of enacting legislation which requires that an agency come back to the Congress for an appropriation. My point is that I do not think Members of the Senate should permit that kind of section to be put in an appropriation bill, because the Parliamentary rules that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

I moved to strike it out for the simple reason that I think it would be a bad precedent to have it remain in the bill. I have no quarrel with the able Senator from Colorado, or with anyone else, that enabling legislation should be enacted to require the FDIC or any other agency to go through the Appropriation Committee if it wants to construct buildings; but I do not think we should permit this sort of requirement to be a part of an appropriation bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 28, line 19, before the period, to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That of such amount not less than \$150,000 shall be available, subject to the provisions of such section 202, for a loan or loans for the provision of housing and related facilities on any Indian reservation for the benefit of elderly persons who are members of an Indian tribe.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall discuss this amendment very briefly. I am sure anyone who is familiar with the conditions under which our Indian citizens live fully recognizes that, of all our American citizens, none face a more dismal future in old age and none are forced to live in worse surroundings than many of our unfortunate elderly Indians. It is for that reason I ask that at least a start be made under this legislation to enable our American Indians to participate in the Government's loan program to help finance resthomes for our elderly citizens. Our Indians have no capacity to provide for themselves the proper kind of housing they will need in their advanced years. Most are Indians without funds or land.

Since this is in the nature of a pilot operation, it seems to me we might provide that on one of these reservations, or in some adjacent area, not less than \$150,000 be made available to ascertain whether or not, through this plan, at long last we can take some steps in the direction of doing justice to our Indian friends. Perhaps more money can be channeled into this program for Indians but my amendment insists only that not less than \$150,000 be set aside for this purpose.

I have discussed the amendment with the chairman and the ranking minority member of the subcommittee. I believe they are prepared to accept the amendment. If so, I have no desire to discuss it further.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the amendment is well taken. The committee had no intention of not covering anyone. If there is any question about covering elderly Indian people on Indian reservations, we shall be glad to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, on page 11, line 6, before the period, to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That except with respect to grants under obligations incurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act, no part of this appropriation may be used as a grant with respect to any airport wherein any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, print, drawing, or other similar indecent or immoral article is made available for sale to the public.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several weeks ago the Chicago newspapers carried a story to the effect that the transit board of Chicago had notified concessionaires that their right of occupancy would be revoked in the event they continued selling lewd, lascivious, or indecent literature.

I commented on the floor of the Senate on the action taken by that commission. The objective which they sought

was obtainable without interference with the rights granted by the Constitution of free speech or otherwise.

This morning, at a breakfast meeting, I listened to Rev. Billy Graham discuss the experiences which he had in Africa. He related that the good which we have done there through our financial help has, in practically all instances, been either neutralized or destroyed by the character of moving pictures and literature which has been sold to the people of those nations by mercenary interests in the United States. He raised the question of the paradoxical nature of the problem. He stated that, on the one hand, he subscribed completely to the philosophy contained in our Constitution that the right of free speech is indispensable for the proper development of a people and for the proper exercise of the faculties given to the human being by the Lord. But he went on to say that a problem confronts the people of our Nation when we find ourselves, in our desire to maintain the right of free speech, faced with mercenary interests who are using the right of free speech for the publication of literature that is breaking down the moral fabric of our youth.

I thought he was completely right. I am sure Members of the Senate are in a constant quandary as to how we are going to solve this problem.

I do not subscribe to a program of censorship. I do not subscribe to the concept that free speech should be hindered. But I deeply feel that ways and means must be found to cope with this problem, which is causing such a severe impact on the moral fabric and fiber of the young people of our country. The book "The Ugly American" has been frequently mentioned. In some degree it may be exaggerated, but the fact is that the evaluation made of the people of our country is, in a substantial degree, related to the character of the literature and moving pictures we send out which are seen by millions of people.

I have made inquiry about the means of reaching this problem in the air terminals. Either counties or cities receive financial aid from the Federal Government for the building of air terminals. Those air terminals are leased to news and magazine agencies. The concessions granted can be attached with conditions, and the leases can contain a provision that the concession shall come to an end if the lessee or concessionaire uses the premises for the sale or distribution of any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, printing, drawing, or any similar indecent or immoral article.

About 2 months ago we appropriated \$25 million to fight juvenile delinquency. It was thought the problem was so severe that the Federal Government would have to step in and, in a measure, declare that the parents, the ministers, the rabbis, the priests, the schoolteachers, the policemen, the prosecutors, the judges and the parole officers were incapable of handling the problem. I thought it was a serious indictment when we declared that all of these agencies were incapable of developing a moral

character in our youth sufficient to face the problems which will confront our youth in life.

Upon reflection, I can well understand the feelings of the mother and father, worried about a daughter, while they are trying to build character, when they view these news agencies, magazines and moving pictures breaking down with their material the very work which the parents are trying to accomplish.

At the proper time, Mr. President, I shall call up my amendment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator has not yet called up his amendment?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have not. I have sent it to the desk.

Mr. KEATING. I am very sympathetic with what the Senator has been trying to accomplish. The situation has worried me a great deal. I have spoken upon the subject on innumerable occasions on the floor of the Senate and at public gatherings.

It seems to me this may be an area in which we can really do something about the problem. I am glad the Senator has brought up the subject.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much. I do not believe the Senator was in the Chamber when I related the statement made by Reverend Graham. He said that when he was in Africa, as well as everywhere else he went, he was told that the good we do with our aid we more than break down with the indecent, lewd, and lascivious literature and moving pictures we are sending to those naive and primitive but still clean and wholesome people.

Mr. JAVITS obtained the floor.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President—

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator from Colorado desire to have me yield to him?

Mr. ALLOTT. If the Senator will permit, I would like to reply to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to say to my friend from Ohio that I sympathize very greatly with what he is trying to do. I am not quite sure whether the plan the Senator has in mind is workable. Perhaps if the Senator is not offering his amendment now we can discuss it later. There are numerous steps necessary to stop what is going on. I wish to inquire whether the Senator intends to present his amendment now, or later.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall present it at a later date.

Mr. ALLOTT. At a later date?

Mr. LAUSCHE. At a later time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio. I wish to be sure that I retain my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has the floor, and yields to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I recognize the difficulty, from the technical standpoint, of coping with the problem, in view of what the Supreme Court has said. I feel deeply that we must start giving attention to the problem. I believe under circumstances of

this type, as pointed out by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] we may be able to reach the problem with the language I have in mind, although if we tried to censor the moving pictures or the books the language would not be proper.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. That was the only feature about the proposal which in any way worried me. I am in complete accord with the objective of the Senator from Ohio. I doubt whether we can accomplish it by a censorship provision. I doubt that it would be advisable or desirable to do it in that way.

The only difficulty I had in regard to the proposal was with respect to the definition of what would fall within the purview of the Senator's amendment. I hope we can do something about the matter in the bill under consideration. Has the Senator submitted the language to the legislative counsel?

Mr. LAUSCHE. The legislative counsel drew up the amendment. It was stated that my doubt about the ability to do this was not justified, because the amendment does not contemplate directly or indirectly any censorship, but would merely attach a condition to the grant of money.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Who would make the determination?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It would be the board which allocates the money.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Like the Senator from Colorado, I am very sympathetic with the objective of the Senator. However, this is a bill which would give to the Federal Aviation Agency the money to maintain the safety of airlines in the United States. The money would be granted under a legislative formula to the different places. I do not know whether we would want to give General Quesada the job of going out and looking at all of the magazines at every airport in the United States, to see what he thought about them. He is the Director. One man is named; that is General Quesada. The CAB would have nothing to do with this.

I think the Senator from Ohio appreciates the practical problem which is involved.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Like other Senators, I am heartily in favor of what the Senator from Ohio is trying to do, but I sincerely believe what is proposed is not the way to do it. What is a lewd book? We know that the Postmaster General has had cases carried to the Supreme Court.

The language would provide, as the Senator from Washington has said, that General Quesada would have to go to

Cleveland, Ohio, we will say, to look at the books on the newsstand—

Mr. LAUSCHE. Or to Boston, Mass.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Or to Boston, Mass. We find there is a great deal of difficulty with respect to differences of opinion.

No one is more sympathetic than I to the objective of the Senator. I hope the Senator will seek to attach his amendment to a legislative act, rather than to an appropriation bill. I think this provision would be incapable of administration if placed in the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I recognize all of those difficulties. I will say, however, that we had better begin to think about the problem. We cannot keep saying, "There is nothing we can do."

I realize that all of my associates recognize the seriousness of this problem.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KEATING. I emphatically agree with the Senator. It has been brought to my attention that some of the most terrible material which has gone through the mails has been sent as the result of a little boy or a little girl sending in a quarter for a model airplane or something of that kind. This vile material is sent through the mails, and now is being sent through carting companies and by other means. It is a national problem. It is not a local problem. Many unsavory people are fattening their pocketbooks as a result. This is a problem we must face up to.

Fortunately, many fine groups and individuals all over the country are up in arms about this Niagara of smut which is coming through the mails and being distributed on newsstands and by other means. They are complementing the vigorous efforts of the Post Office Department to wipe out this blight of pornography.

In my view, the traffic in obscene material is one of the most serious moral and social problems confronting America today. It has contributed substantially to the rise in juvenile delinquency, in spite of the unceasing war being pursued by authorities at all levels.

I doubt that the general public has any comprehension of how serious this problem has become. It is doubtful that most people realize how extensive this filthy traffic is today.

The fact of the matter is that the pornography and obscenity business in this country has become a half-a-billion-dollars-a-year enterprise. It is big business with capital "B's" and it is high time we called a halt to its filthy machinations.

Of course, as has been pointed out, one of the very real problems involved in curbing these barons of obscenity is simply the definition of what is pornography. What may represent pornography by the standards of most decent people may not be so classed by the courts, under some recent decisions.

We in Congress must grasp this nettle. I have sponsored legislation to help alleviate this problem, and I intend to pursue actively my studies of other

means to put these dirty businessmen out of business. Certainly the proposal of the Senator from Ohio deserves careful consideration by Members of the Senate in the light of the severity of the challenge posed by obscene material.

Mr. President, it is high time Congress got cracking on this whole subject. Some helpful and informative hearings have been held and a great number of legislative proposals have been considered. I hope we can come to grips with some of these ideas. Federal action should and can be taken to effectively supplement the vigorous and wonderful efforts being undertaken by so many groups and individuals on the local level all over the Nation.

Of course, on the local and individual level, it is a matter of demanding strict enforcement of existing statutes, or reporting all violations that come to light. It is a matter of supporting authorities who are trying to do something about keeping this filth out of the hands of our children. In this connection, I want to reiterate my commendation of the Post Office Department, which has spearheaded a nationwide campaign in this field.

Concerted public cooperation and further action by Congress hold the key to stemming this flood of filth which threatens to infect so many of our young people. I am not certain whether the bill before the Senate is the proper vehicle to use in this great cause. I should like to talk with the Senator about it, because he has certainly put his finger on something with which we must come to grips.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I will say to my friend from Ohio that I am sure we all have the same purpose. I do not know whether this would represent legislation on an appropriation bill or not. I think the particular amendment would not. That is simply my opinion.

The thought I am proposing to the Senator, I think, might be more effective than the language the Senator has suggested, which I believe would be terrible in effect. One day the administrator might go to the newsstand and might find only books and magazines on Christian charity, but the minute he walked out, or the next day, the newsstand might be filled up with all the trash in the world.

As the bill now reads, such language is omitted. However, I should like to suggest to my good friend for his consideration that contracts for grants under obligations might contain or should contain such a limitation as he suggested, and it seems to me that the proposal to which I refer could easily be a better and more workable way of getting at the problem.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Colorado, and I also thank the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for his consideration in allowing us to have time for this discussion.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I am sorry I did not hear all of the discussion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. Today he told me the nature of the amendment he intended to present. I do not know its full scope, but I would like to say I approve and commend the purposes of the Senator from Ohio. I think all Senators should be very much aware of the problem he has presented, not only in this particular set of circumstances, but everywhere in our country. I shall support him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky very much.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am going to acquaint the Senate with a situation with which I feel it my duty to acquaint the Senate. It relates to my amendment 60-20-60-B, which has been printed and is before the Senate.

To the amazement of every traveler from foreign countries to the United States and to the amazement of people from other parts of the United States, when one gets into an airport in one of our Southern States and walks through the lobby of that airport, he sees a big bronze tablet which says, "This airport was erected with the aid of funds of the United States of America." Nonetheless he finds in that airport toilet facilities which are separately apportioned for white and colored, as the saying euphemistically goes, and waiting rooms which are classified for white and colored. The arrangement is absolutely fantastic to anyone who does not live in that part of the country and he has difficulty to account for it. As a matter of law the arrangement is completely unlawful, but there it is.

We are pretty familiar with these practices, since we are having a great national struggle concerning them, but I must say it is amazing when the practices and procedures and, indeed, the written directives of a Federal Government agency tolerate the situation. It not only tolerates it but, by implication, tells the applicant for Federal funds exactly how he can get around the fact that the Federal funds are not supposed to be made available for any such facilities.

I shall not take too much of the Senate's time in going into this matter, but for the interest of Senators who are present, as well as those who are not but will want to know how consideration of the amendment will proceed, I should like to make the following statement. I do not actually intend to call up my amendment until after I have made my presentation on it. I have been informed that at that time, when the Senate floor is again available under the rules, a motion will be made to table the amendment. I hope very much the mover of that motion will allow such modest debate and rebuttal as Members may feel moved to make on the question, and I shall seek a yea-and-nay vote after the motion to table is actually made and the debate is concluded. I so state in order that the attachés of the Senate may advise Senators as to the situation and may guide themselves accordingly.

What are the facts? The Federal Government, as is well known, under the Federal Airports Act gives an opportunity to local communities—indeed, to individual operators—to build airports with Federal aid. A practice has grown up in that situation under which I believe the basic policy of the Constitution of the United States and the law of the United States is being frustrated and circumvented in utilizing these funds to build airports within which one then finds completely segregated facilities for dining, restrooms, and perhaps in some cases even other types of facilities. Depending upon whether one is white or Negro, one is allowed or is not allowed to use certain of these facilities.

There is no segregation on airplanes but there is segregation in airports. In view of the fact that this is true, as I said, right under the cover of the activities of a Federal agency, I think it is time to bring it out into the open and to put a stop to it.

How does the agency tolerate any such situation? What it does is to make a loan for the airport building itself, and to omit in the specifications for the building certain spaces in that building, which are left completely vacant, and for which, indeed, FAA does not put up any loan. Later, or contemporaneously, the local community which is building the airport terminal with Federal aid uses its own funds for the purpose of putting in these particular structures, whether they are restrooms or dining rooms or waiting rooms, and segregates them.

Mr. President, one understands perfectly clearly that the big costs which are involved are the costs for the building. However, once the building is constructed, once the fundamental structure is erected, it does not cost very much to put in these additional facilities. Yet this trick, this practice, which is engaged in results in having local communities which believe in segregation, segregate the facilities. They are segregated in terms of national and international travel, not just in terms of the residents of the community involved.

I said that the Agency, at the very least, tolerates it, and, at the very worst, permits it. How does it do that? I suggest that Senators should look at the regulations of the FAA, the Agency which succeeded the Civil Aeronautics Administration, particularly the regulations which were issued on April 6, 1956. They are found at page 617 of the hearings. The policy statement is entitled "Airports Policy and Procedure Memorandum No. 41." It was issued by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics originally, but is, in effect, a regulation of the FAA. It provides as follows:

"(3) No Federal-aid airport program funds will be made available for the development of separate facilities or space in an airport building when such facilities or space are designed for use now or in the future for separate racial groups."

The purpose and intent of the policy expressed in this programing standards is to prevent the use of Federal funds to further or to increase racial segregation in airport buildings. Under this policy, Federal-aid airport program funds will not be used in

the construction or reconstruction of any areas of a building which are intended for use by separate racial groups.

This is the fundamental policy and procedure. At least that is what we are told, according to the policy and procedure memorandum of the FAA.

It goes on to provide—and this is the gimmick:

It will, therefore, be required, prior to the issuance of a grant offer for any project involving a building, that the chief executive officer of the sponsor of each building project clearly state, in writing, whether or not it is the intent of the sponsor that all of the areas and facilities in the building will be available without regard to race, creed, or color, and are intended to be operated on a nonsegregated basis.

If not, it will be necessary that the written statement describe those areas and facilities within the building which are intended for segregated use.

Just think of it, Mr. President. Here is a policy and procedure which provides that no facilities are to be used in such a way as to be segregated. Yet here is a refutation of that policy. This is a refutation of the purpose and intent of the policy expressed in the programing standard, because in the same memorandum we find the statement that it will be necessary that the written statement describe the areas and facilities within the building which are intended for segregated use.

The memorandum goes on to specify just what the written statement is to describe if there is to be this exception and exclusion.

Mr. President, how brazen can one get? Here is an agency which has the fundamental policy that these facilities shall not be segregated; yet for all practical purposes it gives instructions to the individual applicant on exactly how these facilities are to be segregated, in direct violation of the agency's own policy.

It is inconceivable to me that this should occur right under our very noses; that we should be asked to appropriate \$80 million for this program, yet should be denied the opportunity of correcting this most offensive situation which is being participated in by an agency of the Federal Government.

I will say this—and everyone knows it—that this is just inertia. In other words it was the way it was done in 1955 and 1956, and it just goes on, until someone stops it. I think it is high time to stop it.

I felt it my bounden duty to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate.

I testified before the committee on this subject. Because I know very well the concerns about so-called antisegregation amendments, and how Senators feel about them, I suggested to the committee that if we could get a statement of policy from the Agency as to how they would carry out this program, it might fully meet the requirements of the situation.

That procedure has served very well with respect to other bills. One I know of particularly is the National Defense Education Act. In that case a letter was obtained from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. How-

ever, FAA has not budged on this point. Hence the only thing I felt I could do was to propose the amendment, which I will call up, as I said, when I have concluded my remarks.

I have heard arguments against preventing proper restrictions being placed on an agency which would lend itself to this practice. The arguments are, of course, that we do not generally like to offer this kind of amendment if we can avoid it. The answer is that this is such a shocking situation that we cannot avoid it.

The second point is one to which I should like to address myself for a few minutes. It is the question of whether this is the kind of amendment which is found in the Federal aid to public school construction bill as it came to us from the House of Representatives, and which aroused considerable interest here. It was felt that if we kept that amendment in the bill it would result in defeating the whole bill. I have been asked by a number of Senators in connection with my own amendment to the pending bill, "What is the difference between your amendment and the so-called Powell amendment?"

There is all the difference in the world, and it boils down to this. If we deny money in a public school construction situation on the ground that the school has not desegregated, then we are taking action which the Supreme has qualified in its decision on the public school desegregation cases.

The Supreme Court has qualified it by saying that desegregation of public schools shall take place with all deliberate speed. In other words, it has qualified it in point of time. Although personally my own views may have some modified application in that situation, I must agree with the Supreme Court's ruling. It is possible to make the argument that the question of all deliberate speed should be left to the courts, and that the question of all deliberate speed should not be decided by a governmental agency which has the responsibility of disbursing funds for school aid.

That is not the case in the present situation, for in the situation before us no time lag is envisioned by any Supreme Court decree or by any law.

In the situation before us, we are frontally lending the loaning power and the authority of a Federal Government agency, whether by implication or directly, to the proposition that what is now immediately unlawful shall be used to perpetuate or to establish segregated facilities within an airport, notwithstanding the fact that they are now and immediately unlawful—not that they will be unlawful if they are not segregated with all deliberate speed, but that they are now and immediately unlawful.

As authority for that statement, I refer to the basic law itself, which is found in title 49, section 1110, United States Code, annotated, which relates to how these funds are to be loaned, and under what conditions. I shall read the first clause of the law. It is very clear on the subject:

As a condition precedent to his approval of a project under this chapter, the admin-

istrator shall receive assurances in writing satisfactory to him that (1) the airport to which the project relates will be available for public use on fair and reasonable terms and without unjust discrimination.

If that is not clear enough, in a case decided very recently in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, the so-called Greenville case, the court unequivocally states that it is unlawful for a State, or any governmental subdivision thereof, to maintain segregated facilities specifically within an airport. It is the unanimous decision of the circuit court of appeals.

There is no question about the fundamental law which is involved. It was sustained earlier this year in a case involving a segregated airport restaurant in Atlanta, Ga. It was sustained last year in a case involving the Memphis airport. Then we have the Greenville airport case, which is very recent, having been decided only a few months ago. The full text of the Greenville decision is printed at page 618 of the Senate committee hearings. The case is entitled "Henry Against Greenville Airport Commission."

The very point that there are very recent cases, and that this practice is directly and immediately unlawful—it does not have to wait for any deliberate speed, but is immediately unlawful—is used as an argument against my amendment, on the ground that the amendment is not really essential because a suit can be started in every case which involves segregated facilities, in order to enjoin their continuance.

It seems to me that that argument would cause us, just like the rather strange interpretation of the regulations of the FAA, which I read, to be, by implication, parties to a violation of the law and a violation of the Constitution. We would be advancing money which a Government agency is affirmatively using to help—again I say, at the very most indirectly—an illegal establishment of segregated facilities. We would be lending money, but would be telling some individual to go ahead and sue if he did not like what occurred, because we were giving the money knowing it would be used for this purpose.

I think such a use of Federal funds is inexcusable and unforgivable on the part of Congress. There is a host of declarations by the highest officials of the Government that Federal funds must not be used to establish segregated facilities. The President of the United States himself, in my hearing, during one of his campaigns, in a great rally in New York, made that absolute pledge to the American people. I simply do not see how we can possibly get away from it.

When I say this is actually going to happen, I come to another argument which is very strongly urged against my amendment, namely, that my amendment reaches situations in which the Federal Aviation Agency has already contracted for certain facilities, and that \$500,000 of the \$80 million appropriated by the bill will be used for a terminal building at Birmingham, Ala., and for a similar building at Tallahassee, Fla. In both of those buildings we know

now there will be segregated facilities—rest rooms, waiting rooms, and perhaps dining rooms. In both instances, the FAA has already contracted to lend the money.

In respect to that argument, I say two things. It makes it very clear, beyond a peradventure of a doubt, that if we appropriate the money, we will be helping to bring about a violation of the law and the Constitution. Second, it is hornbook law that a contract which has in it an element of illegality is an invalid contract. Certainly it is a contract which, as the lawyers say, is beyond the power—*ultra vires*—even of an official of the United States. We have no right to enter into a contract which flies in the face of the law. There is no morality which holds otherwise, in my view.

Finally, the argument is made against my amendment that people have committed funds on the strength of loans they expect to get from the FAA, and therefore they should not be deprived of those loans at this time. That is what lawyers call the estoppel argument. I think there are two answers.

First, we are closing a Federal loophole. We are closing a loophole by which we are quite unwittingly lending ourselves to the continuation and the establishment of new segregated facilities, rather than doing our utmost to eliminate them.

Second, it seems to me very clear that the unfairness of this kind of utilization of Federal funds for this kind of segregation far outweighs the embarrassment to an individual who has put some money into this kind of proposal in the expectation of receiving a Federal loan.

Before I call up my amendment, I should like to conclude with this observation: I have been a Member of the House and Senate for about 13 years. I know of no time when the atmosphere gets quite so chilly, and when people become quite so restless and unhappy, as when this subject is brought up. Whatever may be the deep psychological reasons for it, this is one situation with which we must live in this country. I have always been the first to affirm the sincerity of the convictions of the men and women who take the very opposite view of this situation from mine. I have never hesitated to debate it with them in the public forum and on the floor of either House. But I have always respected their views.

Notwithstanding that, in this day and age, with what we have at stake in the world in terms of our relationships with the overwhelming preponderance of people having skins which are yellow, black, or brown—not white—I simply cannot understand how we can fail to scratch the bottom of the barrel, if we have to, let alone take as obvious an amendment as this one, in a situation in which a traveler to the United States on an international carrier, if that traveler is himself a person of color, coming to an airport in the southern part of the United States, will find that he cannot sit in a waiting room with Americans; he must go into a separate waiting room for black people; that he may not use the same toilet facilities; and that in some cases he may not use

the same dining room. How can we possibly justify that? It would be hard enough to justify it on moral grounds if provision as to the subject were not imbedded in our Constitution and in the law of the land. It seems inconceivable to me that we can justify it when it is actually unlawful, and so declared by the courts, so declared by the law, and so declared by the policy of the FAA itself, which at the same time, in the same memorandum, instructs people how to avoid it. It is inconceivable to me; I cannot understand it.

Finally, we must in some way get at this situation. We have tried to do it. We have had long debate. We are trying to do it now on the basis of the right to vote, as our first effort in this regard. That is all to the good. I hope we will make much progress.

But when as obvious a situation as this one hits us in the face, to use a curbstone term, and when every opportunity is given to the agency itself to do something about it, but it will not move, it seems to me that the situation calls only for the kind of remedy which, in extremis, I have proposed today. There is simply no other way out, and nothing else which can be done, much as any of us would try to do something else about it.

Mr. President, it is for that reason, and on those grounds, and in view of the complete documentation on this situation, which I have submitted both to the committee and to the Senate, that I believe there is nothing else for me to do except propose this amendment.

I believe we have worked out a procedure which will be economical of the time of the Senate and, I hope, of temper, in terms of the debate.

I repeat that I am addressing myself solely to the issue; and I shall not attempt to castigate either the agency or any individual who is approaching this matter.

But, Mr. President, after so clearly and demonstrably proving the situation, which can be confirmed by observation by any person who goes to an airport in the southeastern part of our country, I felt that, as a Senator, I must try to do something about that situation. That is why I am about to propose this amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I am impressed by what the Senator from New York has said; and his remarks suggest to me now I would feel if I were to enter the airport at Orly, France, or North Holton, England, or at Bonn, or at Madrid, or at Ciampino, Italy, and there read on a plaque that the airport had been built by means of the use of Federal funds, but that persons of some given nationality or color or race—which might, for example, include me, as a citizen of the United States—would be required to use facilities separate and apart from those available to other persons who made use of that international airport. In that event, I believe I would get a bad impression.

Travelers in increasing numbers now come to the United States from all over the earth; and they are of many kinds and many races and many nationalities. They come from the very ends of the earth.

I must say that I agree with the Senator from New York that we should not give propaganda material to those who are hostile to what we are proud of in the American way of life. We should not affront either our visitors or our own citizens.

Although I am of the opinion that the law already is clear, and does prohibit the separation of such facilities, nevertheless I recognize the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from New York; and I am glad to announce here that I shall be happy to support it.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that there are other airports in which exactly the same situation exists, in addition to the two—the one at Birmingham and the one at Tallahassee—that are affected by the pending bill. In addition, there is the airport at Montgomery, Ala.; the airport at Meridian, Miss.; and the airport at Natchez, Miss. There may be others; but I have cited enough to indicate that this practice is by no means a limited one which has not received much attention.

Mr. President, I now call up my amendment which deals with this matter—it is identified as "6-20-60-B"—and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from New York will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, in line 6, it is proposed to strike out the period, and insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the liquidation of contract obligations incurred for the construction of airport terminal buildings containing racially segregated dining or other facilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 251]

Alken	Curtis	Jackson
Allott	Dirksen	Javits
Anderson	Dodd	Johnson, Tex.
Beall	Douglas	Jordan
Bennett	Dworshak	Keating
Bible	Eastland	Kerr
Bridges	Ellender	Kuchel
Brunsdale	Engle	Lausche
Bush	Ervin	Long, Hawaii
Butler	Fong	Long, La.
Byrd, Va.	Frear	Lusk
Byrd, W. Va.	Fulbright	McCarthy
Cannon	Goldwater	McClellan
Capehart	Green	McGee
Carlson	Hart	McNamara
Case, N.J.	Hartke	Magnuson
Case, S. Dak.	Hayden	Mansfield
Chavez	Hickenlooper	Martin
Clark	Hill	Monroney
Cooper	Holland	Morse
Cotton	Hruska	Morton

Moss	Saltonstall	Thurmond
Mundt	Scott	Wiley
Muskie	Smathers	Williams, Del.
Pastore	Smith	Williams, N.J.
Prouty	Sparkman	Yarborough
Proxmire	Stennis	Young, Ohio
Randolph	Symington	
Russell	Talmadge	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, now that more Senators are present than were present previously, I wish to take 2 minutes to explain the amendment. After that I shall be perfectly ready to vote, and I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

The amendment seeks to prevent the Federal Aviation Agency from making available grant funds for the construction of airport terminals, within which there will be segregated facilities—facilities within the shell furnished by the Federal grant, substantially, which may be used for segregated dining rooms, restrooms, and waiting rooms.

Mr. President, Senators will observe upon their desks a mimeographed memorandum explaining the amendment, which carries the whole argument I have made.

The law under which the agency functions says very clearly that these grants are to be made "without unjust discrimination." The Airports Policy and Procedure Memorandum of the agency specifically states the policy is not to have segregated facilities among the facilities financed by its grants, yet in the same memorandum the people are told exactly how to go about accepting some of the grants so that the facilities can be segregated. It is very blatant, Mr. President. The memorandum is to be found at page 617 of the record of hearings before the committee. It is very clear that if one wants to provide segregated facilities the agency tells one exactly how to go about getting the grants and still providing segregated facilities.

Mr. President, it is inconceivable in this day and age that we should lend ourselves to any such illegal operation. Certainly the court will enjoin any such thing at any airport, but that means it is necessary to take each situation to court. We should not provide Federal money, in the way of grants, to perpetuate a situation which the courts would enjoin as illegal—which the courts have enjoined as illegal as recently as the case decided in April of this year, which is referred to at page 610 of the hearings before the committee upon this subject.

Mr. President, I cannot see how in good conscience we can fail to restrict the expenditure of funds of the Federal Government on grants in respect of a matter of this character, and how we can allow any foreign or domestic traveler to come into an airport, read the plaque on the front of the building which says it is built with Federal funds, go in, and find, if he is a person of color, be he an Indian or a Ghanaian, or a person from anywhere else in the world, that he is restricted as to where he may go, where he may sit, and what facilities he may use in that airport. It is

for that reason, because we could not get a change in policy from the agency, that I proposed the amendment.

Accordingly on my amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New York.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I cannot let this occasion pass without expressing my approval of the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS]. It seems to me that terminal buildings are organic buildings. One sees the Federal shell outside, which is supposed to be nonsegregated, and then the local or State area inside, which is segregated. This is a purely artificial method used to defeat the purpose of the law.

We remember that Solomon had a similar problem when two mothers contested for a child. Solomon's proposal was to cut the child in half and award one-half to one mother and the other half to the other, which resolved the controversy rather quickly.

A terminal building is almost as organic as a child, and this attempt to have locally segregated areas inside a building which is federally financed is equally an effort to defeat the purpose of the law. So I very much hope that the amendment of the Senator from New York will be agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I shall be very brief. The committee went into this subject in some great detail. It is not as simple as the description of the Senator from Illinois, because it is an appropriation bill and involves contracts that have been made previously.

The amendment should be proposed to the Federal Airport Act. I strongly favor the purpose of the amendment. This is my 24th session in Congress and I have voted for every single bill of this type. In fact, I have introduced many of them before some Senators who are sitting here today arrived. So, reluctantly, because we have had two legal opinions on this subject, I must oppose the amendment.

Lawsuits against the Government would be filed. Five small airports for which contracts were made are at present involved. I assure the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and all other Senators that any amendment presented to the legislative committee involved which would require future contracts to contain clauses of the kind proposed by the amendment of the Senator from New York, would have the committee's approval.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. In present contracts provision of the type suggested is included, but the amendment of the Senator from New York involves going back to a few small contracts that were made in instances in which local authorities went ahead and built airports. Sometimes the contractors were paid monthly and sometimes they waited until the airport was completely constructed

to request Federal grants. In a couple of cases that happened.

No one has been more zealous in the cause of antisegregation than has the Senator from Washington, but the present bill is not the place for this type of action. The proposal should be put on the calendar of the committee considering the Federal Airport Act. As I said, under present contracts I am assured provision is made for the situation described. I brought the subject to the attention of the committee, and the committee has instructed me to move to table the amendment, which I must reluctantly do.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I announce that I shall move to table the amendment of the Senator from New York.

I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend for his courtesy in yielding to me. I will take only 2 minutes. I regret very much to conclude that this is a clear-cut moral issue and that there is no justification that I can see for the letter of Mr. Lowen representing the CAA which appears in the record at page 617 of the hearings. It seems to me that the situation described in the letter is a clear evasion of law. I regret very much that in their wisdom my colleagues have concluded that they do not wish to be recorded on this issue. I would like the record to show that I support the Senator from New York.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks two letters from Daggett H. Howard, General Counsel of the Federal Aviation Agency to the chairman of the committee, one dated May 20, 1960, and the other dated June 22, 1960, on the legal aspects of this problem.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., May 20, 1960.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent
Offices and General Government Matters,
Appropriations Committee, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter is in response to the questions asked by the subcommittee at the hearing on May 17, 1960, concerning a proposed amendment to H.R. 11776 offered by Senator JAVITS, and is also in response to your request that the General Counsel of the Federal Aviation Agency provide the subcommittee with his written views as to the legal implications of the proposed amendment.

We appreciate very much the opportunity to submit to the subcommittee our thoughts on some of the legal problems which may arise if the amendment to H.R. 11776 proposed by Senator JAVITS is enacted into law.

At the outset, we wish to express our sympathy with the aims of Senator JAVITS. We think those aims are highly commendable. However, it should be made clear that the Federal Aviation Agency does not now provide funds for the development of segregated facilities in airport buildings. Our policy in this respect is set out in 14 C.F.R. 550.24(1) (5) in the following language:

"(5) No Federal-aid airport program funds will be made available for the development

of separate facilities or space in an airport building when such facilities or space are designed for use now or in the future for separate racial groups."

We have given considerable thought to the practical problems involved if Senator JAVITS' proposed amendment is adopted. Assuming its validity, it would have the effect of denying some important safety items to the public using airport facilities over a large part of our country. For example, the Federal Aviation Agency would be prohibited from expending funds for the construction of control towers where such towers are to be a part of an airport building falling under the restrictions in Senator JAVITS' proposed amendment. Moreover, the Agency would be prohibited from providing funds to house weather reporting and communications activities in any part of such an airport building.

Aside from the obvious fact that the proposed amendment may be substantive legislation in an appropriations act, we have more serious questions regarding its legality. The funds called for in H.R. 11776 are to meet existing contractual obligations, not obligations which may arise in the future. We believe the proposed amendment would result in lawsuits against the Federal Government on the basis that an existing valid contract is property and that property rights are protected by the Constitution whether the obligor is the United States or others. The United States is subject to the due process clause of the Constitution; and, in its contractual relations with others, the U.S. rights and duties are governed generally by the law applicable to contracts between private individuals.

Even if the proposed amendment were not objectionable on legal grounds, we feel it is inherently unfair to those who have expended their funds in reliance upon financial participation by the United States, as well as disruptive of needed airport development.

Sincerely yours,
DAGGETT H. HOWARD,
General Counsel.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., June 22, 1960.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce
Committee, U.S. Senate, Washington,
D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: A member of your staff has inquired as to our views on a reworded version of the proposed amendment to H.R. 11776 offered by Senator JAVITS. You will recall that I answered certain questions asked by the committee on the earlier version in my letter to you of May 20, 1960. The new language we were asked to consider reads as follows: "Provided, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the liquidation of contract obligations incurred for the construction of airport terminal buildings containing racially segregated dining or other facilities."

We do not feel that the changes in language cure the proposed amendment of the defects we noted in our previous comments. It is still my considered legal opinion that the amendment, even as reworded, is of questionable legality and would result in lawsuits against the Federal Government. As I indicated in my previous letter, such lawsuits could be brought on grounds that an existing valid contract is property.

Accordingly, it is my legal opinion that the practical result of the proposed amendment would be to subject the Federal Government to costly administrative burdens and protracted litigation, without achieving the result Senator JAVITS seeks. The Federal Government would, in the end, be forced to make the payments, in the form of settlement of claims or judgments, even though normal payment from these appro-

priations were barred by the proposed amendment.

I am convinced that the present grant agreements are valid contracts in this respect, that they are not contracts made in violation of any law, and that it would be a futile gesture for the Federal Government to refuse payment thereunder on the grounds Senator JAVITS seeks to assert through the proposed amendment. If it is the wish of Congress to achieve the objective sought by the Senator, the most appropriate and least troublesome way to accomplish this is by direct amendment of the Federal Airport Act itself.

I might add at this point a few brief words of clarification as to the present law and the policy followed under it by the Federal Aviation Agency. In my previous letter, I set forth the provisions of 14 CFR 550.24(1)(5), which are to the effect that no Federal-aid airport program funds will be made available for the development of separate facilities or space in airport buildings when such facilities or space are designed for use now or in the future for separate racial groups.

I think it might be useful to point out to your committee just how this Agency's policy on this matter works and how it does have the effect of reducing Federal grants-in-aid for airport terminal building projects in which there are racially segregated facilities. For example, let us say that an airport terminal building is to be constructed for \$100,000 and that \$10,000 of this is to go for construction of segregated dining facilities. This \$10,000 item would be completely denied as an allowable project cost. Thus, if the Federal share is to be 50 percent, the Federal grant-in-aid would be \$45,000.

On the other hand, let us assume that an identical terminal building is to be constructed for \$100,000, but the same \$10,000 dining facility is not to be racially segregated. In this case, the 50 percent Federal contribution would be \$50,000.

This policy is strictly applied in all instances by the Agency and has the effect of reducing Federal contributions, as illustrated, whenever a racially segregated facility is involved. I wish to emphasize that we guard against any bookkeeping or other adjustments anywhere else in the program which might otherwise nullify this policy. We are extremely careful not to permit any increased participation in the remainder of the project which could convert this into a mere bookkeeping exercise. The policy has teeth and is strictly administered.

If you or your committee have any further questions, we shall be very happy to answer them.

Sincerely,

DAGGETT H. HOWARD,
General Counsel.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. ALLOTT. The Senator from New York, who made the request for the yeas and nays, is present in the Senate, as are most of the other interested Senators.

I would like to call to the attention of the Senate the statement of the General Counsel of the FAA which appears on page 126 of the hearings:

Aside from the obvious fact that the proposed amendment may be substantive legislation in an appropriations act, we have more serious questions regarding its legality. The funds called for in H.R. 11776 are to meet existing contractual obligations, not obligations which may arise in the future. We believe the proposed amendment would result in lawsuits against the Federal Government on the basis that an existing valid

contract is property and that property rights are protected by the Constitution whether the obligor is the United States or others. The United States is subject to the due process clause of the Constitution; and in its contractual relations with others, the U.S. rights and duties are governed generally by the law applicable to contracts between private individuals.

I would like to say to my chairman and to my friends in the Senate that there is no Senator—and I am sure the Senator from New York will agree—who supported all measures of this kind any more assiduously than has the senior Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] who is the chairman of the committee, and I shall support this type of legislation in a legislative bill. But I do not think this type of provision should be put in the present bill as a limitation on contracts which have already been created.

I followed the argument of the Senator from New York, and I would like to discuss it at greater length. But I think the law needs some beefing up. I will support him and, in fact, I will join him in such proposed legislation, but I do not think this is the place for it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me very briefly?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I will take no more than 1 minute. Whatever else my reputation may be, I do not think I have acquired a reputation for long-windedness.

I was made aware of the letter of the counsel by the chairman of the committee. I answered it. My answer is found at page 615 of the record. To make it very specific, so Senators will follow my argument, my point was that when a contract of this character was made to provide a grant, the only time the matter came to us at all, because the law now permits the agency to make these contracts, was under an appropriation bill. Therefore, this occasion was the only time I could bring the subject to the attention of the Senate. I have tried to get a change in policy in the agency, and I have been completely unsuccessful for reasons which were completely beyond me. This was the only remedy I had, and the argument as to existing contracts was answered, in my view. The point is that they are ultra vires the United States, because they are unlawful. The courts have said so, and the law says so. The statute allowing the grant says so. That completely explodes the argument and gives us no other way to get out of the situation. Any contracting party can fully qualify for the grant by not using the subterfuge suggested by the agency itself, namely, having segregated facilities.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will join with the Senator from New York. We can get at the situation. I know where we can get at it, and get at it in the right way.

Mr. JAVITS. Allow me to say something in fairness to the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Colorado. Those two Senators are more zealous in respect to equal rights to all Americans than they are. I respect the sincerity of their views, though I deeply disagree with them in this discussion.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move to lay the amendment on the table.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 252]

Aiken	Ervin	McNamara
Allott	Fong	Magnuson
Anderson	Frear	Mansfield
Beall	Fulbright	Martin
Bennett	Goldwater	Monroney
Bible	Green	Morse
Bridges	Gruening	Morton
Brunsdale	Hart	Moss
Bush	Hartke	Mundt
Butler	Hayden	Muskie
Byrd, Va.	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Byrd, W. Va.	Hill	Proty
Cannon	Holland	Proxmire
Capehart	Hruska	Randolph
Carlson	Jackson	Russell
Case, N.J.	Javits	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Scott
Chavez	Johnston, S.C.	Smathers
Clark	Jordan	Smith
Cooper	Keating	Sparkman
Cotton	Kerr	Stennis
Curtis	Kuchel	Symington
Dirksen	Lausche	Talmadge
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Thurmond
Douglas	Long, La.	Wiley
Dworshak	Lusk	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Ellender	McClellan	Yarborough
Engle	McGee	Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPLE] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 29, as follows:

[No. 253]

YEAS—58

Alken	Ervin	Mansfield
Allott	Frear	Martin
Anderson	Fulbright	Monroney
Bennett	Goldwater	Moss
Bible	Green	Mundt
Bridges	Hayden	Pastore
Brunsdale	Hickenlooper	Prouty
Butler	Hill	Russell
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Saltonstall
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Smathers
Cannon	Jackson	Smith
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Carlson	Johnston, S.C.	Stennis
Case, S. Dak.	Jordan	Talmadge
Cotton	Kerr	Thurmond
Curtis	Long, La.	Wiley
Dirksen	Lusk	Williams, Del.
Dworshak	McClellan	Yarborough
Eastland	McGee	
Ellender	Magnuson	

NAYS—29

Beall	Gruening	Morse
Bush	Hart	Morton
Case, N.J.	Hartke	Muskie
Church	Javits	Proxmire
Clark	Keating	Randolph
Cooper	Kuchel	Scott
Dodd	Lausche	Symington
Douglas	Long, Hawaii	Williams, N.J.
Engle	McCarthy	Young, Ohio
Fong	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—13

Bartlett	Humphrey	Robertson
Carroll	Kefauver	Schoeppel
Chavez	Kennedy	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Murray	
Hennings	O'Mahoney	

So the motion to lay on the table Mr. JAVITS' amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New York was agreed to.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUMPHREY subsequently said: Mr. President, with regard to the vote relating to the tabling of the motion by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] I was in an informal hearing relating to the report on the food and drug industry of the Federal Trade Commission, with the Chairman of the Commission and the staff of the Federal Trade Commission. I wish to have the RECORD show that I arrived at the Chamber immediately after the vote was announced. Had I been in the Chamber I would have voted "nay." I regret that I was unable to arrive by the time the vote was announced. I assure my colleagues that I made every attempt to be present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has an amendment, and that he is willing to have it considered under a time limitation. Therefore, I suggest that the Senator from Ohio now call up the amendment; and I ask unanimous consent that during its consideration there be not to exceed 5 minutes to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANON in the chair). Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, my amendment is as follows: On page 11, in line 6, before the period, insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That except with respect to grants under obligations incurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act, no part of this appropriation may be used as a grant for the building of any airport facility unless the contract under which the grant is made contains recitals prohibiting the sale or distribution to the public or otherwise of any obscene, lewd, or lascivious book, pamphlet, picture, print, drawing, or other indecent or immoral article; and provided further, that if such materials are so sold or distributed, the recipient of the grant shall become obligated to repay such grant to the Federal Aviation Agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, under these circumstances, I could not present my amendment within 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate be in order.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, about 2 months ago the Transit Authority of Chicago issued upon concessionaires an order that if they sold lewd or indecent material on the newsstands, their rights in possession of the leased property would be terminated.

This morning, at a meeting, I heard Reverend Graham make the statement that while he was in Africa he was told repeatedly that the good we have done with our aid has been more than neutralized by the damage we have done with motion pictures and indecent literature.

I do not think I need argue to my colleagues that a grave problem is confronting the people of our country with respect to mercenaries who are intent upon making profits, even though they are contaminating the moral fabric of our youth.

I recognize that there may be a parliamentary flaw in this amendment; but I suggest to my colleagues that we cannot delay dealing with this vital problem concerning the people of our Nation. We cannot hope to survive if we tolerate mercenaries who sell materials which we know are destroying the moral fabric of our youth.

I receive many letters from mothers who write to me, "I am worried about my children. You are allowing damaging materials to be sold. Why do not you do something about it?"

There are some who will say this amendment violates the free-speech guarantee in the Constitution. But the amendment does not do so at all. It merely provides that the U.S. Government, as a condition to the making of a grant, demands that the property which will be built out of the grant shall not be used for the purposes which I enumerate in the amendment.

I have consulted the Legislative Reference Service, and have asked the drafter of the amendment whether it would collide with the decision of the Supreme Court that language of this type is uncertain, and therefore not adequate to bring into existence an intended piece

of legislation. The adviser in that department said this situation is different, because in this amendment we are not dealing with the constitutional right of free speech, but we are merely attaching a condition as a prerequisite to the obtaining of a grant.

Mr. President, that is my case. I present the amendment to the Senate, for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I believe that the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] has left the Chamber. A moment ago he suggested that he reserved a point of order against this amendment. I do not know whether he is soon to return or not.

I merely wish to say that I do not suppose there is any Member of this body who has any objection to the motive behind the amendment. I am perfectly willing to take the amendment to conference. Everybody wants to attach something to an appropriation bill, and nobody wants to go to the committee procedure. That is the simple way to do it. Sometimes amendments such as the last one we voted on are offered to appropriation bills. Nobody has been more in favor of civil rights than the Senator from Washington has, and I was for it long before some of my colleagues were here; but when an appropriation bill is brought to the floor, we are subjected to embarrassment by being asked to vote on a proposal that does not belong in the bill at all.

Someone has said, "Your friends hurt you more than your enemies do." Everyone is against lewd literature, or at least that should be the case. This is a local matter, of course. Grants-in-aid are sometimes predicated upon local bonds. Airports are operated wholly by local people, and I presume there are local laws. I was once prosecuting attorney in my county. We operated an airport, and we had some laws.

This is a fine amendment. I do not know how it would be enforced, however. I am sure General Quesada will not ride around in his airplane every day and thumb through articles on the newsstands and see what is there. I do not know that I would want to trust his judgment too much in deciding whether the material was lewd or obscene. What is probably considered to be one thing in Boston might not be considered to be such in Las Vegas.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I merely want to ask him which way does he mean? [Laughter.]

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think Senators know which way. That is another problem that is involved. No one disagrees with the statement that there is a problem involved. I have seen some airports where conditions are bad; but all we do is give local communities money to help them build airports. Sometimes we do not give them 50 percent. In some years we have not given them anything. But, because the Federal Government gives them money, we want to dig into their affairs and tell them how to run

their airports. In the case of Federal aid to education, there would be a big hue and cry around here if an amendment were attached to the bill stating what kind of books were to be used in schools, just because Federal money is spent in that field. I do not want that responsibility. We would be talking States' rights from now to Christmas on that one.

I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that perhaps we ought to do something about the problem, but I do not know why we do not do something about these things in the proper place.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Was this proposal ever presented to the committee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; it was not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was not.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Ohio has stated it was more forcefully called to his attention only recently.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I think no Senator could conscientiously and honestly say, "I have not worried about this problem." No Senator would dare say it. No Senator would dare go before the public, seeking support, and say he is not concerned about the problem of the sale of indecent literature.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think everyone has been concerned about it, and I think the Appropriations Committee of the Senate started activity in this field, as relates to the Post Office Department, concerning the abuse of the mails. That activity was started in the committee of which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] is chairman.

I am not talking about the amendment of the Senator from Ohio as such. I am talking about procedure in the Senate. Senators wait until an appropriation bill shows up, and then Senators who are in favor of the proposal presented are forced to vote against it because they want to see that orderly procedure is adhered to, and that Senate business is conducted in an orderly way.

There is no objection to the amendment on the part of the Senator from Colorado or the committee. I am willing

to take the amendment to conference. I will do the best I can to have the conference adopt some wording along the line the Senator from Ohio has suggested.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, has my time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have 1 minute.

I recognize the strength of the argument made, but I submit to the Senate the time has come when we had better start thinking of ways and means of coping with this problem.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have the highest admiration and respect for my friend from Ohio. This matter is clearly legislation. It has no place in an appropriation bill. It is affirmative. It gives direction. It is legislative in character. The problem ought to be handled in another way. We seek to do it through hearings, and through the activities of the Appropriations Committee we have carried on a great program in this field. So let us follow the customary and ordinary legislative process, rather than this kind of procedure.

Therefore, Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that under rule XVI, subdivision 4, the amendment is subject to a point of order, and the point of order is sustained.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] has an amendment, on which he is willing to accept a time limitation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a brief moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. I should like to say to the Senator from Ohio that I think he has raised an exceedingly important issue. I urge him to prepare legislation to deal with his problem in a way that will be acceptable to the Senate. I ask him to let me join him in sponsorship of such legislation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio feels deeply frustrated when he is left with the impression that there is indifference in this body about this problem.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Washington—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor. He has yielded to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Vermont, and ask unanimous consent that he may ask a question of the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Washington about an item under "Construction and Acquisition."

Under "Construction of Public Buildings," there is a planning item for a courthouse in Montpelier, Vt. Is that correct?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Montpelier, Vt., is included under the construction and acquisition portion of the bill, as well as Derby Line, Vt.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the amount of \$120,000 provided for sites and expenses for the Montpelier project?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Sites and expenses, \$120,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Can the Senator tell us what the amount is for Derby Line, Vt.?

Mr. MAGNUSON. \$37,000 for sites and expenses.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, for the benefit of other Senators, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a tabulation of the sites and expenses and improvement costs in all the States.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Construction and acquisition

	Total		Detail of revised 1961 estimate reflecting proposed GSA amendments	
	In request to House	Revised estimate	Sites and expenses	Improvement cost
1. Construction of public buildings:				
(A) Inside the District of Columbia:				
Federal office building No. 8 (HEW) 2d and D Sts. SW.....	\$23,840,000	\$16,244,000	-----	\$16,244,000
Federal office building No. 9 (OSC) 19th and E Sts. NW.....		22,002,100	-----	22,002,100
Federal office building No. 10 (Federal office building) (NASA-FAA) Independence and 6th to 9th Sts. SW.....	45,090,000	42,583,500	-----	42,583,500
GPO field plant.....	627,000	627,000	\$627,000	-----
U.S. Court of Claims and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals Bldg.....	7,500,000	6,591,000	-----	6,591,000
Total, inside District of Columbia.....	77,057,000	88,047,600	627,000	87,420,600
(B) Outside the District of Columbia:				
Decatur, Ark., post office, Federal office building.....	223,000	223,000	223,000	-----
Camden, Ark., post office, etc.....	745,000	683,650	-----	683,650
Bakersfield, Calif., Federal office building.....	114,000	114,000	114,000	-----

Construction and acquisition—Continued

	Total		Detail of revised 1961 estimate reflecting proposed GSA amendments	
	In request to House	Revised estimate	Sites and expenses	Improvement cost
1. Construction of public buildings—Continued				
(B) Outside the District of Columbia—Continued				
San Francisco, Calif., courthouse, Federal office building	\$43,866,000	\$38,996,900		\$38,996,900
Hartford, Conn., courthouse, Federal office building	8,984,000	7,951,400		7,951,400
Wallingford, Conn., post office, etc.	263,000	263,000	\$263,000	
Wilmington, Del., courthouse, customhouse, Federal office building	900,000	900,000	900,000	
Gainesville, Fla., post office, courthouse	350,000	350,000	350,000	
Miami, Fla., Federal office building	8,325,000	7,076,250		7,076,250
Tampa, Fla., Federal office building	908,000	908,000	908,000	
Statesboro, Ga., post office, etc.	133,000	133,000	133,000	
Thomasville, Ga., post office, courthouse	1,287,000	1,151,600		1,151,600
Boise, Idaho, courthouse, Federal office building	702,000	702,000	702,000	
Chicago, Ill., courthouse, Federal office building		5,500,000		5,500,000
Seymour, Ind., post office, etc.	124,000	124,000	124,000	
Augusta, Maine, post office, Federal office building	310,000	310,000	310,000	
Jackman, Maine, border station	341,000	289,850		289,850
Van Buren, Maine, border station	335,000	322,550		322,550
Vanceboro, Maine, border station	299,000	272,150		272,150
Webster, Mass., post office	131,000	131,000	131,000	
Clarksdale, Miss., post office, courthouse	419,000	419,000	419,000	
Tupelo, Miss., post office, etc.	100,000	100,000	100,000	
Billings, Mont., courthouse, Federal office building	612,000	612,000	612,000	
Sweetgrass, Mont., border station	600,000	648,600		648,600
North Platte, Nebr., post office, courthouse	312,000	312,000	312,000	
Reno, Nev., courthouse, Federal office building	469,000	469,000	469,000	
Albuquerque, N. Mex., warehouse	552,000	469,200		469,200
Bismarck, N. Dak., post office, courthouse	3,793,000	3,323,050		3,323,050
Toledo, Ohio, Federal office building	4,559,000	4,065,700		4,065,700
Tulsa, Okla., post office, Federal office building	2,495,000	2,495,000	2,495,000	
Westerly, R.I., post office, etc.	274,000	274,000	274,000	
Charleston, S.C., Federal office building	248,000	248,000	248,000	
Sioux Falls, S. Dak., post office, etc.	515,000	515,000	515,000	
Memphis, Tenn., courthouse, Federal office building	11,279,000	10,577,150		10,577,150
El Paso, Tex., border station	1,342,000	1,155,700	100,000	1,055,700
Ogden, Utah, courthouse, Federal office building	870,000	870,000	870,000	
Derby Line, Vt., border station	37,000	37,000	37,000	
Montpelier, Vt., post office, courthouse	120,000	120,000	120,000	
Dayton, Wash., post office, etc.	332,000	301,100		301,100
Richland, Wash., post office, courthouse	582,000	582,000	582,000	
Cheyenne, Wyo., post office, courthouse	1,127,000	1,127,000	1,127,000	
Total, outside District of Columbia	99,148,000	95,212,850	12,528,000	82,684,850
Total, construction of public buildings	176,205,000	183,260,450	13,155,000	170,105,450
2. Extension and conversion of buildings:				
Nogales, Ariz., border station	509,000	509,000	509,000	
Detroit, Mich., inspection headquarters	1,029,000	925,050		925,050
Wyandotte, Mich., post office, etc.	114,000	114,000	114,000	
Johnstown, Pa., post office, etc.	280,000	280,000	280,000	
Philadelphia, Pa., post office, courthouse	6,814,000	5,825,500	224,000	5,601,500
Total, extension and conversion of buildings	8,746,000	7,653,550	1,127,000	6,526,550
3. Unspecified projects				
	49,000	5,218,000	5,218,000	
Total 1961 estimate	185,000,000	196,132,000	19,500,000	176,632,000

NOTE.—Revised May 6, 1960.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Schedule 5. Projects approved by House and Senate Public Works Committees on the basis of reports submitted pursuant to sec. 11(b) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959 for which no funds are specifically provided in 1961 bill

[See explanation in Senate report]

	Total estimated cost	Site and expenses	Improvement cost
Georgia: Winder, post office, Federal office building	\$659,000	\$104,000	\$555,000
Hawaii: Honolulu:			
Post office, courthouse	23,500,000	1,270,000	22,230,000
Quarantine station and clinic	1,887,000	157,000	1,730,000
New Mexico: Albuquerque, post office, courthouse	10,700,000	2,045,000	8,655,000
Ohio: Cleveland, courthouse, Federal office building	47,921,000	5,176,000	42,745,000
South Dakota: Pierre, Federal office building	3,415,000	456,000	2,959,000
Total (6 projects)	88,082,000	9,208,000	78,874,000

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the question of passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] may offer his amendment, that the Senate have 30 minutes to discuss the amendment, and that the time be

equally divided between the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT and Mr. MUNDT addressed the Chair.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Presi-

dent, I yield first to the Senator from Colorado, and then I shall yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, with regard to the literature, I think the chairman of the committee made the point very clear. What happens when such amendments are presented to the Senate is that Senators are put in the position of voting against some things in which they believe, but which have no place in the appropriation bill.

I say to the Senator from Ohio that my own interest—and I am sure this is true with respect to the interest of the Senator from Washington and of many other Senators—has not been confined to trying to stop the distribution of lewd literature in the last day or the last week. My interest has been evident over a period of years. There have been Supreme Court decisions, troubles in regard to drafting proposed legislation, and troubles in regard to the enforcement of the law. We have had many problems.

I think it is improper to present these amendments to the Senate and to try to attach them to appropriation bills.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. May I have the attention of the Senator from Ohio, please? I am sure the Senator will be able to sleep better tonight when he learns of the fact that the Senate Committee on Government Operations today unanimously reported from the committee a bill dealing with the problem of obscene literature. We had before the committee two measures, one introduced by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and one which I introduced. One would provide for a White House conference. My bill would provide for a continuing commission to make a study of this problem and make recommendations effectively to deal with the problem across the board. The bill was unanimously reported. The Senator may be assured that we will be given an opportunity to deal with this problem in the present session of Congress.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In closing my remarks, I was willing to present my argument in 5 minutes, but though I took such little time, while I was speaking my colleagues were yelling "Vote! Vote!" I do not think that is worthy conduct.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I join the Senator from Ohio in expressing the hope that we can all vote upon the measure before the session of Congress adjourns. The bill relating to obscene literature has been reported, and it will be upon the calendar before the end of this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Texas yield the floor?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 28, line 19, it is proposed to strike out "\$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50,000,000".

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from New Jersey desire the yeas and nays on his amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered would raise from \$5 million to \$50 million the funds for the program of direct loans to private nonprofit groups for housing for our elderly citizens. I was glad to accept the limitation of time, because the Senate has already very forcefully demonstrated that it recognizes the need for this sort of program.

Last year, in recognition of the fact that those citizens in this country to whom we owe the most are getting the least, we authorized \$50 million for a loan program for housing our senior citizens. This year the housing bill, as passed by the Senate, raised the authorization from \$50 million for the revolving loan fund to \$75 million. Notwithstanding the authorization, appropriations were not provided last year to implement the program.

This year the House passed and the Senate committee proposes \$5 million, describing this as money to be used for a pilot project. I respectfully suggest that a pilot project of study and development is not needed. We know the need. We have demonstrated our recognition of these needs in many ways. The RECORD is replete with the recognition that those who have the lowest incomes, our older folks, simply do not have the money to pay the higher rents which are necessary when the housing is developed under the regular commercial interest rates.

This program, if put into operation, would provide housing with monthly payments nearly \$20 less than would be possible with conventional financing.

For example, under FHA financing, a \$10,000, 40-year mortgage would result in monthly payments of \$54.80. Housing under this direct loan program would permit private nonprofit corporations to provide comparable facilities for \$36.50 a month, or \$18.30 less than under FHA.

The FHA program which we have for senior citizens is limping along because the interest rates which are charged produce rents which are out of reach for millions and millions of our older citizens.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter which was addressed to the Committee on Appropriations by members of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]. It vividly documents the need for the amendment I am proposing.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 3, 1960.

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Independent Offices Subcommittee,
Committee on Appropriations, U.S.
Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: A major unmet need of the elderly is the provision of safe, sanitary and congenial housing at a rental which older persons can afford. This conclusion was reached by the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, of which the undersigned are members, after extensive hearings in Washington and in seven cities across the country. National experts in the field of aging, local administrators working with older persons in their home communities, and hundreds of older citizens themselves were heard. The subcommittee also conducted extensive staff studies and made personal visits to the homes of older persons: In roominghouse areas, in homes for the aged, in public housing developments,

and in privately owned facilities. Everywhere the conclusion was the same. The retired aged of the Nation have common problems which include low income, a need for independent living, and meaningful social activity to avoid loneliness and frustration.

As a result of these findings, the subcommittee recommended that the Congress take action, in this session, to appropriate funds authorized by the direct loan program (sec. 202, Housing Act of 1959) to assist private, nonprofit groups to provide housing and related facilities for the elderly. After seeing the nature of the problem at first hand in the course of a year's study, the subcommittee felt that the \$50 million authorization, which as not even appropriated last year, is a negligible revolving fund in relation to the need. However, it would be helpful as a stimulating demonstration. The subcommittee recommended that the authorization be raised to \$100 million and that this amount should actually be appropriated for use in fiscal year 1960. It called upon the Federal agencies to act quickly on this program.

The undersigned members of the subcommittee strongly urge that the Committee on Appropriations recommend appropriation of the full \$50 million authorization this year as a significant start to meet the housing requirements of many of America's low-income senior citizens.

The subcommittee invites your attention to the following:

1. There are now 16 million people over the age of 65 and in just 20 years there will be 24 million. Even more significant is the fact of a rapidly growing number of those over the age of 75. There are now almost 6 million over 75 and in 20 years there will be close to 9 million over 75, the majority of whom will be women and a very large number of them will be single or widowed. One of every three, 60-64, has a parent or close relative to be concerned about.

2. Half the couples over the age of 65 have less than \$2,500 a year in income. Six million people are thus below the minimum standard of living for a couple in a city today. In addition, 2 million single, or widowed persons, have less than \$1,500 a year in income. In total, there are approximately 8 million people over the age of 65 today who cannot afford decent housing and still obtain proper nutrition, adequate medical care or necessary recreation.

3. The average benefit for a person presently on social security is \$72 a month. The average benefit for a couple is \$120 a month. An aged widow now receiving social security must subsist on an average of \$56 per month.

4. In 1959, two out of every five spending units whose head was over 65 had liquid assets of \$200 or less. Two out of three had less than \$2,000 in liquid assets to handle emergencies or cover daily living expenses.

5. Many elderly have health problems which create special housing needs. Although the number of people over 65 is 8.9 percent of the population, they have 40 percent of all cases of heart disease. Eight out of ten of the elderly have one or more chronic conditions as reported by the National Health Survey. They have approximately 55 percent of all the chronic conditions which limit mobility. But the millions of older citizens who no longer enjoy robust health "neither want or need the full-time attention of an institution."

6. They often own and live in houses that are too old and too big for them, or rent single rooms too small for them in rooming-houses.

7. A higher percentage of older persons are found in slums, either because urban blight has covered a familiar neighborhood or because the low incomes of the elderly prohibit better housing. Slum clearance activities in turn produce other hardships as

older people are forced to vacate the only housing they can afford.

As we all know, the mere citation of statistics hardly begins to portray the urgency of the need. Some illustrations from the testimony of the subcommittee may be helpful to the Committee on Appropriations in considering this matter. In its visits, the members of the subcommittee talked to an aged widow who lives in a roominghouse area. She pointed out that she and the other elderly tenants in the building were virtually homebound. She said:

"We are free to go out in the daytime, but can't even sit on the benches in the sun because of the people who are drinking, and it's dangerous for us to go out of our rooms in the evening because of the hoodlums who are around. Even the doctor won't come in the evening. He turns down calls saying that it isn't safe for a well-dressed man to come alone to our neighborhood."

A citizen in a small community told us: "I think we need a lot of housing—something must be done about it. I know of many cases where several older folks are living in just one room—cooking, eating, sleeping—and when they get sick they have no place to go."

Older persons want to be independent, they want to live alone. A white-haired widow told us:

"Every time a social worker comes to us she tells us to go and live with our children. Our children have their own problems. No man wants his mother-in-law to come and live with him, and no woman wants her husband's mother to join the family because she wants to be mistress of her own home. Therefore, we would rather have a place of our own."

Dr. Russell Lee of the Lee Clinic, San Jose, Calif., testified before the subcommittee in San Francisco on five problems, and he put housing in first place. Dr. Lee said:

"This country can ill afford the perfectly awful facilities that are provided for older people today. Many of these are just human cesspools. They have designed some of the most magnificent facilities in the world for the care of older people and they exist now. Everybody, rich and poor, who gets older should be able to live in a home of that quality. We are amply able to do it with our financial resources."

Mrs. Marjorie Borchardt, president of the Senior Citizens Association of Los Angeles, said, "Housing in the Los Angeles area is the greatest problem." Many senior citizens have to pay more than half of their income to get housing. Describing the living conditions, Mrs. Borchardt testified:

"Many thousands of them live in light housekeeping rooms where they cook, eat, and sleep, and many of them have to use the same toilet and bath facilities. So far, private enterprise in Los Angeles County has not provided the adequate low-rent housing."

We could cite many more examples from our testimony, our letters, and from our personal visits. However, the major point that we wish to emphasize is that the housing produced under the FHA mortgage insurance program generally is so costly that it can hope to serve only a small segment of the elderly housing need and too often the least urgent segment. An effective, bold program must be undertaken to provide housing for the elderly at a rental that millions of them can afford, particularly private rental housing.

Congress recognized the necessity for expanding Federal action to meet this national problem. The Housing Act of 1959, which was finally passed after two Presidential vetoes, retained the \$50 million direct loan provision, included in the two earlier bills. Nevertheless, the President did not request an appropriation for this program in his fiscal 1961 budget. The House Approp-

riations Committee has recommended that only \$5 million be appropriated for the coming fiscal year on the grounds that only a pilot program should be initiated at this time. This recommendation ignores the statistical and human data gathered by the subcommittee showing the extent and urgency of the need. In addition, various welfare, labor, and religious groups already have plans underway for construction of special housing facilities which are being held up by the lack of capital at reasonable interest rates. (See following letter as example.) There is an immediate necessity for carrying out the \$50 million direct loan program without delay.

To illustrate the potential benefits of the direct loan program and the relatively low rate of interest it produces: At the present time the rate of interest applicable to the direct loan program is 3½ percent. This represents a cost of \$3.65 per month for every \$1,000 of a mortgage over a 40-year period. Under the regular FHA mortgage guarantees of 5¼ percent, the cost would be \$5.48 per \$1,000 per month over a 40-year period. Thus, on a \$10,000 mortgage there would be a saving to the individual in the rent that he pays of \$18.30 per month. For millions of senior Americans this sum represents the difference between dignified, healthful living and a demeaning slum existence.

The difficulties involved under present high interest costs were portrayed eloquently by Monsignor W. F. Suedkamp, Secretary of Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of Detroit. In testifying on the experience of the Carmel Hall project in Detroit, he indicated that the total debt service on Carmel Hall, if it were mortgaged today, would be a 7¼ percent per \$1,000 for each year on the unpaid balance. This was made up of interest at 5¼ percent, amortization expenses of 1½ percent, and FHA insurance at one-half percent. He stated:

"It does not solve the low cost housing problems. The debt service charge is so high that if a nonprofit organization was to borrow money to build housing for the aged, they would have to charge exorbitant costs to live in a newly created facility."

He added:

"I think the solution is a direct lending program from the Federal Government similar to the one used in college dormitory programs."

In his testimony before the Subcommittee on Housing of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency in Washington, on May 17, Monsignor Suedkamp described his pioneering and nationally renowned work at the Kundig Center. Here 80 persons who might otherwise have been in public institutions continue to live in the community in the main stream of life without being public charges. They pay their own way; the maximum charge is \$75 a month covering room, board, social and medical needs. Their parish facilities provide a centralized living room and dining room, giving rise to what is often called a campus residency program for low income, not completely independent elderly right in the community. Monsignor Suedkamp indicated that if the direct loan funds were actually available, the Kundig Center could replace its old worn-out buildings and expand its facilities.

Another witness, Mr. Martin Fine, vice-chairman of the Miami Housing Authority and of the Governor's Advisory Committee on the Aged in Florida, testified that he had studied the applications of 300 people for low rental housing. Seventy-six percent of these people had an average monthly income of \$84.35. They were living in substandard rooms with high rents or doubled up with relatives or friends. Among the other applicants, 7 percent lived in trailers, 5 percent were facing eviction, and 4 percent required first floor accommodations for health

reasons. He reported that there are now 600 applications for a 64-unit low income project in Miami. Work on other projects for the elderly could be undertaken immediately under a low interest direct loan program.

While there is no single solution to the housing needs of the elderly, the problem clearly is now of such magnitude that substantial action must be taken at this session on the direct loan program. The Congress can inspire a great nationwide effort on behalf of the poorly housed aged and solve an increasingly critical problem for many aged Americans through the appropriation of the \$50 million authorized in the direct loan program.

Respectfully,

PAT McNAMARA,
Chairman.

JOHN KENNEDY.
JOSEPH CLARK.
JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

EDINA COVENANT CHURCH,
Edina, Minn., April 29, 1960.

Senator PATRICK V. McNAMARA,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McNAMARA: In a recent conference with the Reverend John M. Mason, who is head of the social welfare department of the Evangelical Lutheran Church (now the American Lutheran Church), we have learned of the direct Federal loans for housing the elderly, a bill which was recently passed by Congress. This is to be made available to nonprofit organizations, and is explained briefly in a "Summary of the Housing Act of 1959," pages 4 and 5, copy of which I have in my possession.

We are planning to build a 40-bed home for the elderly (or nursing home), just as soon as financing can be arranged. Our organization is the Colonial Acres Homes, Inc., a nonprofit, nondenominational home, of which I am to be administrator and chaplain. Members of the corporation are from my church and family who are interested in this type of ministry.

We have purchased a 7-acre site, which has been approved by the village council for such a purpose.

We understand that this bill must be signed by the President before appropriations can be made, presumably sometime in May. We would appreciate having information as to when this might be, as we are very anxious to make formal application for such financing. Would you kindly forward to me any information regarding this that you may have? We would appreciate this very much.

Very sincerely,

A. ELTON PALMQUIST,
Pastor.
EUGENE A. HAGBERG,
Assistant Pastor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I hope the promise which went out across the land, found in the authorization we passed, will be honored by the acceptance of an amendment which will provide money to put the program into effect, to provide the first real opportunity for the United States to provide decent housing for the millions of low-income elderly families at costs they can afford.

The increase I am proposing here is itself a very modest response to an overwhelming need. It seems to me that this is the least we can do to let the millions of our elderly families know we no longer intend to neglect their very serious needs.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to rise today in support of the amendment of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS]. Appropriations for the purpose of providing housing for the elderly of our Nation is a must in this session of Congress. Additional public action is necessary to answer this growing problem. Stimulation of construction, taking into account the needs and capabilities of our elderly people, is necessary. The problem of housing the elderly is an acute one—especially among those of low and moderate incomes and those in need of some form of physical assistance.

Today there are 16 million Americans over the age of 65. This represents 9 percent of our population. With each passing year, this total increases, both absolutely and in relation to the total population.

Medical research has resulted in an increase in the length of life of the average person. With this increase in life span have come new and pressing problems which must be faced up to and answered.

The immediate popularity of smaller sized residences has made it less likely that families today have space for their parents in their own apartments and homes. Thus, fewer and fewer older persons live with other people, and more are required to live by themselves. Detailed statistics show that in housing a disproportionate number of our older citizens live in one room, while at the other end of the curve, an approximate number live in units of eight and more rooms. Large houses draw immensely on the strength and incomes of the elderly, both of which are declining in this segment of our population. The conditions under which the elderly live are generally poor. These are, it must be noted, the people who maintain their own homes.

The conditions under which almost one-third of the rest of the older people of our Nation live are certainly not better. Most of them live with their families or friends in a household of limited size or with younger people, resulting in physical or psychological problems for all concerned. Conditions of contemporary urban living are not conducive to a three-generation household.

Older persons have their own special housing needs. Architects and housing constructors have found that less steps, low bathtubs which are easier to get in and out of, handrails, and so on, are essential to the well-being of these people. The physical and social needs of older people have long been ignored. Commendable efforts to correct this situation are being made by private groups and certain States, but much more remains to be done.

Under the Housing Act of 1959, authorization for direct loans to nonprofit groups for rental housing for the elderly was set at \$50 million. Under the bill being discussed today, only \$5 million would be appropriated to this revolving fund. In the light of the pressing needs of the elderly, this amount is far too little. I am therefore more than happy to lend my support to the amendment of

the Senator from New Jersey. I hope it will be agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am grateful to the Senator from Minnesota for his remarks.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey on the amendment which he has offered to appropriate the full authorization for direct loans to nonprofit groups to provide housing for the elderly.

The Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging received eloquent and urgent testimony in Washington, and in seven cities across the country, from experts, from administrators, and from older persons themselves as to the need for decent housing for senior citizens at a rental which they can afford.

I could quote at great length from our testimony with respect to the low incomes of our senior citizens, the desperate living arrangements which so many of them are forced to accept, and their health problems and the kind of housing which is suitable for them.

But I shall only take the time now to stress as emphatically as I can that after seeing the problem at firsthand I know \$50 million for direct loans at low rates of interest is a tiny figure in relation to the need. It is the least that we can do now.

There are many religious and other groups throughout the country which would apply immediately for funds to build suitable, respectable housing for the senior citizens of this country at rentals they could afford if the interest charges were not prohibitive, as is the case today.

The Congress can take a great step forward on behalf of the poorly housed aged of this Nation by appropriating, at this session, at least the \$50 million authorized in the Housing Act of 1959.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am indeed privileged and proud to be a co-sponsor of the amendment. I think the committee is to be congratulated for recognizing the principle involved.

I say this most respectfully, Mr. President, the amount of \$5 million is a mere mockery compared to the needs of the aged and aging in this country today. After all, we are not appropriating money for public housing as such. All we are seeking to do is to allow the sincere people who are dedicated to the welfare of the aged and aging to borrow money to build houses to accommodate these elderly people in reasonable comfort. We are asking for an interest rate which is comparable to the interest rate on college housing.

If we recognize the needs and properly so, of our students attending our colleges, why should we turn our backs on

the aged who cannot help themselves? The proposed amendment is an encouragement to people in private industry who will build these homes, and it provides the opportunity to borrow the necessary money at reasonable rates of interest to accommodate aged people.

When we consider the vast and increasing elderly population in this country, \$5 million is a meager amount when compared to the need. We desperately need more money, and I urge Senators to pour out their hearts on this amendment, recognize the need, support and vote for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island. I say also that the subcommittee on the aged had ample authority and evidence that there are groups throughout the country who are ready to apply now for money under this proposed loan program if we appropriate the money into the revolving fund.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, and as a member of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee, I would like to add my support to the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey, which is cosponsored by the Senator from Rhode Island. Both of those committees have made studies of the problem, and I am confident that their recommendation that this appropriation should come up to the amount of the authorization is sound. I hope the Senate will support the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] in the arguments made this afternoon. I think they are unanswerable. Last Saturday afternoon I spoke to several thousand elderly people in the Civic Auditorium in San Francisco, Calif., at a conference of the aged, and I wish to report to the sponsors of this amendment that during this conference there was considerable discussion of the problem of finding adequate housing for the aged. A deplorable condition exists in Portland, Oreg., the largest city in my State, with regard to the housing condition of the aged.

A survey has been made, and the survey shows that we are forcing or requiring many of our aged people to live in such conditions that it is a disgrace to us as a free people that we permit such conditions to exist. I hope the chairman of the committee, who I know is one of the strongest supporters we have for the aged and aging of this country, will see fit to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Texas, though I promised to yield first to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I understand that the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey provides resources for the building of homes for the aged.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Exactly.

Mr. FREAR. Is it proposed that the loans should be in the form of mortgages?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Loans would be provided to nonprofit groups which, of course, would have the security.

Mr. FREAR. How much is the Senator requesting?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The amendment calls for \$50 million to go into a revolving fund.

Mr. FREAR. Is the money to be appropriated on a repayment basis?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. On a repayment basis; and I am sure the experience will be the same as it is under the college housing program, where every penny on every loan has been paid back.

Mr. FREAR. I think I must agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that this is a most worthy amendment that the Senator from New Jersey has offered, although perhaps it is not in a very large amount for the number of aged that we have and the deplorable conditions under which they live scattered throughout the United States. However, I must compliment the Senator from New Jersey on a good beginning.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to commend the Senator from New Jersey for the active interest he has manifested in this subject ever since he came to the Senate, and, for that matter, I presume, since he was a Member of the House of Representatives. I think this is a very constructive step. In view of the fact that we have \$18 billion or \$19 billion of loans on housing, \$50 million is a mighty small amount for this group of people which represents a large percentage of the population in this country. There is no one in the Senate who is more diligent or more effective in his work for the aged people than is the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and I wonder if we could get the chairman's consent to take the amendment to conference, and to fight for it in conference. I ask him if we could not have the committee accept the amendment, waive the yeas and nays, and go on to the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should be more than glad to accept the amendment. I wish to put it in the bill. The committee approved a bill authorizing \$50 million, and the Director of the Housing Administration, who has been against this proposal, set up some other loan features for so-called elderly housing, so that they would not have to go after this provision. All that has been done, as the Senator from New Jersey has said, in all

this time is to provide approximately 4,000 units in the whole country for these people.

So the House of Representatives suggested that we start with \$5 million to make a pilot plant study, so that the program could get under way. The House inserted such provision in the bill, which Congress passed.

Mr. Mason appeared before the committee and said, "I want you to take out that provision. I don't believe in it."

The Senator from Washington asked him:

Senator MAGNUSON. And you say the administration does not believe in that?

Mr. MASON. That is right.

Senator MAGNUSON. Well, who are you working for?

Mr. MASON. Well, we work for both the Congress and the executive branch of Government.

I said, "Congress has passed a law, has it not?"

Yes; but I do not believe in it.

So I am glad to take the amendment to conference. I think we should. It is well pointed out that the money will be placed in a revolving fund. I can tell the Senate why the provision is not liked. These loans are provided at a lower interest rate than what lenders can receive now, and it is spread over a longer period of time for elderly people. That is why it is not liked.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Will the Senator agree that it is the only practical interest rate at which we will get a housing bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from New Jersey agree to my suggested procedure?

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. I agree.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Will the Senator from Washington also agree?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I agree.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the order for the yeas and nays be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order for the yeas and nays is rescinded.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. [Putting the question.]

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LUSK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. LUSK], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would each vote "Yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP] is absent because of death in his family.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 8, as follows:

[No. 254]

YEAS—75

Alken	Frear	McNamara
Allott	Fulbright	Magnuson
Anderson	Green	Mansfield
Beall	Gruening	Martin
Bible	Hart	Monroney
Bridges	Hartke	Morse
Brunsdale	Hickenlooper	Morton
Bush	Hill	Moss
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Mundt
Cannon	Hruska	Muskie
Capehart	Humphrey	Pastore
Carroll	Jackson	Prouty
Case, N.J.	Javits	Proxmire
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Randolph
Church	Johnston, S.C.	Saltonstall
Clark	Jordan	Scott
Cooper	Keating	Smathers
Dirksen	Kerr	Smith
Dodd	Kuchel	Sparkman
Douglas	Lausche	Stennis
Dworshak	Long, Hawaii	Symington
Eastland	Long, La.	Talmadge
Engle	McCarthy	Wiley
Ervin	McClellan	Williams, N.J.
Fong	McGee	Yarborough

NAYS—8

Bennett	Curtis	Williams, Del.
Butler	Goldwater	Young, Ohio
Cotton	Thurmond	

NOT VOTING—17

Bartlett	Hayden	O'Mahoney
Byrd, Va.	Hennings	Robertson
Carlson	Kefauver	Russell
Chavez	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Ellender	Lusk	Young, N. Dak.
Gore	Murray	

So the bill (H.R. 11776) was passed.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. CANNON in the chair) appointed Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. HILL, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—
ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 2822. An act for the relief of Low Wing Quey (Kwai);

S. 2886. An act for the relief of Nikoliya Lazic;

S. 2918. An act for the relief of Boris Priestley;

S. 2942. An act for the relief of Eugene Storme;

S. 2964. An act for the relief of Kang Sun Ok;

S. 2991. An act for the relief of Ah See Lee Chin;

S. 3016. An act for the relief of Walter F. Beecroft;

S. 3038. An act for the relief of Jung Hi Pak;

S. 3049. An act for the relief of Oh Chun Soon;

S. 3091. An act for the relief of Pasquale Mira;

S. 3130. An act for the relief of Anne-Marie Stehlin; and

S. 3235. An act for the relief of Cecilia Rubio.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS
APPROPRIATIONS, 1961

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1673, H.R. 11389, the general Government matters appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11389) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce that the Senate will still have for consideration the State, Justice, and judiciary appropriation bill; the civil functions appropriation bill; the military construction appropriation bill. Do I correctly understand that this bill was marked up this afternoon?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. There will also be the mutual security appropriation bill, and a supplemental appropriation bill. That makes five appropriation bills to be considered in the next 2 weeks.

JOHN R. BARKER

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1670, S. 2338, a bill relating to the separation and retirement of John R. Barker.

The bill is noncontroversial. One of the most beloved, able, and respected Members of this body is desirous of having the bill passed today, because he is leaving on an official mission of the Senate. The leadership is always glad to cooperate with the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], because he has always cooperated with the leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The bill (S. 2338) relating to the separation and retirement of John R. Barker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill is passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a point of order. The Senator from Delaware was on his feet, asking for an explanation of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I asked for an explanation of the bill. I thought we might have an explanation before its passage. I think

the Senate should reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which the bill was passed will be reconsidered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, an explanation of the bill is as follows:

Mr. Barker was employed in the postal service from 1914 to 1918, as a rural carrier; from 1920 to 1922, as a substitute carrier; from 1922 to 1934, as postmaster; from 1934 to 1936, as substitute clerk. He was removed from duty on July 18, 1936, for alleged political activities. He was charged with transporting persons to the polls on election day and with being elected a delegate to a county political convention.

With respect to the first charge, the facts are that Mr. Barker did transport members of his own family to the polls and in addition five other elderly folks who were unable to walk and who had requested transportation of him. As to the second charge, Mr. Barker has stated:

I did not attend the caucus which selected the delegates and after the caucus I did not attend the convention to which elected.

The removal action in his case occurred prior to the enactment of the Hatch Political Activity Act of 1939. Both the Post Office Department and the Civil Service Commission state that Mr. Barker's removal "for political activity" would not be warranted under that act as it stands today so certainly was not justified prior to its enactment.

Correction of the reason for his removal will carry with it entitlement to the benefits of the civil service retirement law which would otherwise be denied to him. On the basis of his verified service, enactment of this measure would accord Mr. Barker an annuity of \$54 per month commencing the first of the month in which the bill is enacted. The Civil Service Commission indicates that he may have some additional creditable service which if true would increase his annuity accordingly.

I do not have any more information on which I can plead guilty to the Senator from Delaware. When I was asked to have the bill considered, I thought the beloved Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] would be here to explain it. But he must leave tonight on an official mission at the request of the Senate. Today is the last day he will be in attendance in the Senate. I thought the request was very reasonable. I was advised there was no opposition to the bill.

No Member of the Senate has worked more faithfully and courteously with the leadership, both in the Senate and in committee, than the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in

the administration of the Civil Service Retirement Act, John R. Barker, who served as an employee of the Post Office Department from August 15, 1920, to July 19, 1936, shall be considered to have been involuntarily separated from such service for reasons other than removal for cause. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the benefits payable pursuant to this Act shall be paid from the civil-service retirement and disability fund. No annuity shall be paid, by reason of the enactment of this Act, for any period prior to the first day of the month in which it is enacted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ALLOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MRS. BETTY L. FONK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1616, H.R. 4964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4964) for the relief of Mrs. Betty L. Fonk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay to Mrs. Betty L. Fonk, of Bloomington, Ind., the sum of \$5,000 as compensation for personal injuries and expenses resulting from an accident involving a U.S. Army vehicle in Frankfurt-am-Main, Germany, on June 22, 1955.

Mrs. Betty L. Fonk, the dependent wife of Sgt. Alvin Fonk of the U.S. Army and then herself a civilian employee of the Army, was struck and injured by a U.S. vehicle on June 22, 1955, at Frankfurt, Germany. The vehicle was assigned to the U.S. Army and Air Force European exchange system and was driven by an employee of that organization in the scope of his employment. The report of the Department of the Army to the committee on the bill indicates that subsequent investigation established that the proximate cause of the accident was the negligence of the driver of the vehicle.

The measure was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary. It was introduced at the request of one of the most able, respected, and popular Members of this body, the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I give notice that, if it is agreeable to other Senators, we may proceed to the nominations in the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Federal Communications Commission before the Senate adjourns this evening.

Meanwhile, I ask that the Executive Calendar be called beginning with routine diplomatic and Foreign Service nominations.

ROUTINE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nominations in the routine diplomatic and Foreign Service.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations in the routine diplomatic and Foreign Service administration be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations to the United Nations.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations to the United Nations be confirmed en bloc; but before they are confirmed I call attention to the fact that two most distinguished Members of this body, highly experienced in the field of foreign relations, the beloved Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and the respected Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], are on the list; as also is our friend, Francis O. Wilcox, who served so intelligently on the staff of the committee on Foreign Relations before he was advanced to the position of Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations to the United Nations are confirmed en bloc.

GOVERNOR OF GUAM

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph Flores, to be Governor of Guam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NOMINATIONS TO THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD, AND FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. With respect to the nominations to the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Maritime Board, and the Federal Communications Commission, reports were filed only last Monday. Although I have no objection to their consideration now, I understand that members of the Committee on Interstate

and Foreign Commerce wish to make some remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Washington will notify the Senators that we desire to consider the nominations, we will take them up this evening, because I am getting inquiries as to why I am delaying them.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But they have not been on the calendar more than a couple of days.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The nomination of Vice Admiral Wilson to the Federal Maritime Board has been on the Executive Calendar for almost 2 weeks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. That nomination was reported on June 10.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Today is June 22.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The nomination of Robert E. Lee to be a member of the Federal Communications was reported on June 15.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Some of the nominations have been here for 10 days, some for 12 days.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Ten days is a very short period of time for nominations to be on the calendar in the Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, is there any objection?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; but I am speaking for some of the members of my committee. Some of them wish to make some remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am giving notice for the benefit of all.

The Senator from Wisconsin is interested in some of the nominations. Is he ready to proceed?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes; at any time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Very well.

First, let us pass the General Government matters appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE HOUSING RECORD OF THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, recently the Senate passed the 1960 housing bill. I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to the progress in this important field during the past 7½ years, as reported by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The housing record under our Republican administration reveals that more families now own or are buying their homes than at any time in our history. It is of particular significance to note the great progress also made in urban renewal, slum prevention, and better housing for elderly people.

I ask unanimous consent that this fine report be printed at this point in the body of the Record.

June 25, 1960

of suitable color additives in or on food, drugs, and cosmetics in accordance with regulations prescribing the conditions under which such additives may be safely used (pp. 13298-322). This action was subsequently vacated by the passage of S. 2197, the Senate bill, amended to contain the language of the House bill as amended, and the House bill was laid on the table (pp. 13322-8). The amendments made on the floor were technical amendments. p. 13302

45. WHEAT. Rep. Dixon criticized members of the House Agriculture Committee as being responsible for failure of the House to pass wheat legislation, stating that the Senate wheat bill was a superior bill and should have been acted on rather than the Poage bill. pp. 13343-4
46. WOOL. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9322, to make permanent the existing suspension of duties on certain coarse wool (p. 13271). This bill will now be sent to the President.
47. CASEIN. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9862, to extend until June 30, 1963, the temporary suspension of duties on imported casein (p. 13272). This bill will now be sent to the President.
48. VETERANS' BENEFIT. The Rules Committee reported a closed rule for consideration of H. R. 7903, to extend the veterans' guaranteed and direct loan programs for 2 years. p. 13347
49. PERSONNEL. Agreed to the conference report on H. R. 9881, to extend until July 1, 1962, the temporary suspension of duty on personal and household effects brought into the U. S. under Government orders (p. 13271-2). This bill will now be sent to the President.
- Passed as reported S. 2857, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for refunds of contributions in the case of annuitants whose length of service exceeds the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity allowable under such Act. pp. 13270-1
- The Rules Committee reported an open rule for the consideration of H. R. 12383, to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to make benefits more realistic in terms of present wage rates. p. 13347
50. MINERALS. Disagreed to the Senate amendments to H. R. 10455, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of Feb. 25, 1920, and conferees were appointed (p. 13281). Senate conferees have been appointed.
- Began debate on H. R. 8860, to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands (pp. 13282-98). On an objection by Rep. Kyl, the final vote on passage was deferred until Mon., June 27.
51. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Disagreed to Senate amendments to this bill, H. R. 11776, and conferees were appointed (p. 13281). Senate conferees have been appointed.
52. PUBLIC DEBT. Received the conference report on H. R. 12381, to extend for 1 year the public debt limit and the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates (H. Rept. 2005). pp. 13344-6
53. FOREIGN AFFAIRS. The Rules Committee reported an open rule for consideration of H. R. 11001, to provide for the participation of the U. S. in the International Development Association. p. 13347
54. ADJOURNED until Mon., June 27. p. 13347

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

55. FOOD PRICES. Extension of remarks of Rep. Quie inserting an article, "You Can't Blame Farmers for High Food Prices." p. A5453
56. EXPENDITURES; BUDGET. Extension of remarks of Rep. Taber inserting a letter from the Director of the Budget "showing that the new and unnecessary appropriations pending for back door expenditures would if passed exceed the budget by over \$10 billion." pp. A5467-8
57. FOOD FOR PEACE. Extension of remarks of Sen. Keating inserting an editorial expressing support for Vice President Nixon's food-for-peace proposal. p. A5479
Rep. Curtis, Mo., inserted an article, "Where Mr. Nixon Stands." pp. A5487-8
58. FARM LABOR. Sen. Javits inserted a New York City church resolution favoring the enactment of legislation relating to aid to migrant workers and their children. p. A5480
Rep. Gubser inserted an editorial, "The Bracero Story -- Growers Tell Their Side." pp. A5490-1
59. ITEM VETO. Rep. Schwengel inserted two editorials favoring item veto authority for the President. p. A5491
60. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Ullman inserting an article, "Agricultural Abundance An Asset," and stating that it "highlights an aspect of our farm program that is rendering a real service to America and the world." pp. A5456-7
Extension of remarks of Rep. Levering stating that "I believe it is most regrettable that the House failed to approve farm legislation ..." and that "with all the imperfections which it contained, the legislation voted down was at least a step in the right direction ..." pp. A5457-8
Extension of remarks of Rep. Berry discussing the failure of passage of the wheat bill and stating that "American agriculture is sick, not because of American agricultural overproduction, but because of oversupply, and that oversupply has resulted and will continue to result from excessive imports." pp. A5458-60
Rep. Bonner inserted the statement of a Future Farmer of America about the modern farmer. p. A5473
Reps. Rees and Dorn inserted a statement of the American National Cattlemen's Association to be submitted to the platform committees of the Republican and Democratic Parties in their July conventions. pp. A5493-9, A5515
Extension of remarks of Rep. Hoeven stating that "the failure of the House of Representatives to accept the Senate wheat bill fixes the responsibility on the shoulders of the Democratic Members of the House," and inserting an article, "Failure on Wheat." pp. A5499-500
Extension of remarks of Rep. Pillion inserting the tabulated results of replies to his questionnaire, including four questions on agricultural problems. p. A5509
61. TERRITORIES AND POSSESSIONS. Extension of remarks of Rep. Saylor urging Congress to begin thinking about advancing those "few small islands ... left in a non-self-governing status ... to full self-government," and insertion of a report making recommendations on how this might be accomplished. pp. A5500-2

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, HALEY, EDMONDSON, SAYLOR, and BERRY.

AMENDMENT OF MINERAL LEASING ACT OF FEBRUARY 25, 1920

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10455) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ASPINALL, ROGERS of Texas, MORRIS of New Mexico, SAYLOR, and WHARTON.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1960

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I want to say that the other body included an additional sum in this bill for NASA—the space agency. There is, for instance, \$50 million in the fund for research and development of an emergent nature, and the sum of \$19,213,000 that was deleted from the House version of the bill. A good many things have happened since this bill was considered by the House appropriations committee. We have able men on the subcommittee and I have confidence in them, but since so much has happened since the original hearings, I want to take this time to ask those that the Speaker does appoint to look with sympathy and with favor upon these increases urged upon us by the other body. I think these increases are needed and should be approved by the House. At any rate, I ask especially that our colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and our other colleagues to be appointed by the Speaker give this matter their sympathetic consideration.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend from Texas, who is in charge of this bill, knows of course that since the measure was approved by the House, important testimony has been furnished the Con-

gress of rapidly rising costs in the financing of the space program.

The testimony was given the Appropriations Committee of the other body by Dr. T. Keith Glennan, the head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Dr. Glennan testified that this increase is occurring in the current 1960 fiscal year program of the space agency. In doing so, he pointed out, and I quote:

These unforeseen cost increases have had to be covered at the expense of other programs since no contingency funds were provided. Some of these programs have been reduced in scope, others deferred as we robbed them to get on with the more immediate tasks.

Dr. Glennan advised the Appropriations Committee of the other body that NASA has already identified more than \$20 million of additional costs not covered by the fiscal year 1961 budget request.

The committee was so impressed by Dr. Glennan's testimony and the urgency of the matter, that it restored the funds which the House cut from the budget estimates and included also a \$50 million contingency fund for research and development in order to assure that neither the space program nor the safety of personnel is jeopardized by lack of funds. The other body agreed to the increase, which totaled \$69,213,000 and approved, in all, \$965 million in new funds for the space program for the 1961 fiscal year.

Now, I would be the last one to criticize the Appropriations Committee of this House for reducing the budget estimates. My good friend, the gentleman from Texas, whose subcommittee handled the bill, has an enviable and well-deserved reputation for keeping a sharp watch over the taxpayers' funds and for this he and his colleagues deserve the thanks of every Member of Congress.

But I hope that the gentleman from Texas and his colleagues who will serve with him as conferees on this bill will see their way clear to go along with the other body on the increases in the funds for the space program in view of the urgency of the matter.

The space program is very important to the security and the prestige of this country and of the entire free world. Each time the Soviet Union scores an impressive gain over us in space, we and the free world suffer a hard blow.

I need not remind my colleagues that we have not yet caught up with the Soviet Union in several important aspects of the space program, notably in the size of our big rocket engines. Let us not give Khrushchev any opportunity to crow over us that we can avoid. This program calls for full speed ahead. If the Soviet Union ever gains control of outer space, I shudder to think what would happen to this country.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for his patience and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

I withdraw my reservation to the gentleman's request.

(Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana was given permission to extend his remarks.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. THOMAS, YATES, CANNON, OSTERTAG, and TABER.

TREATMENT OF BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 3117 to treat all basic agricultural commodities alike with respect to the cost of remeasuring acreage. This bill was passed by the Senate on June 18, 1960, and is identical with the bill H.R. 12420 which was passed by the House yesterday on the Consent Calendar.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 374(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1374(b)), is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

SEC. 2. Section 374(c) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary shall by appropriate regulations provide for the remeasurement upon request by the farm operator of the acreage planted to such commodity on the farm and for the measurement of the acreage planted to such commodity on the farm remaining after any adjustment of excess acreage hereunder and shall prescribe the conditions under which the farm operator shall be required to pay the county committee for the expense of the measurement of adjusted acreage or the expense of remeasurement after the initial measurement or the measurement of adjusted acreage. The regulations shall also provide for the refund of any deposit or payment made for the expense of the remeasurement of the initially determined acreage or the adjusted acreage when because of an error in the determination of such acreage the remeasurement brings the acreage within the allotment or permitted acreage or results in a change in acreage in excess of a reasonable variation normal to measurements of acreage of the commodity. Unless the requirements for measurement of adjusted acreage are met by the farm operator, the acreage prior to such adjustment as determined by the county committee shall be considered the acreage of the commodity on the farm in determining whether the applicable farm allotment has been exceeded."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H.R. 12420, a similar House bill, was laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDING PROJECT, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The SPEAKER. The Chair laid before the House the following communication which was read by the Clerk and re-

ferred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1960.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House,
The Capitol, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives approved on June 24, 1960, a prospectus for the following public building project which was transmitted to this committee from the General Services Administration:

Washington, D.C.: The U.S. Court of Claims, the U.S. Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, and the Tax Court of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. BUCKLEY,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTION (H. RES. 556) PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF BILL, S. 1898, AMENDING COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

MR. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution (H. Res. 556) providing for the consideration of S. 1898, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the procedure in obtaining a license and for rehearings under such act, be laid on the table.

In explanation, Mr. Speaker, the resolution, House Resolution 556, was superseded by House Resolution 563, which was adopted by the House.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING]?

There was no objection.

NAACP FOUNDER GETS LENIN PRIZE FROM RUSSIANS

(Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

MR. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, it has been the contention of many for a long, long time that the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People was a Communist inspired and supported organization. Last night a story appeared in the Washington Evening Star which sheds further light on these contentions. On reading it one could come to but one conclusion. The news report from the Evening Star is as follows:

NAACP FOUNDER GETS LENIN PRIZE FROM RUSSIANS

W. E. B. Du Bois, Negro writer and one of the founders of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, last night received the 1958 International Lenin Prize for contributing to peace among nations.

The presentation was made by Mikhail N. Smirnovsky, Russian Charge d'Affaires, at the Soviet Embassy.

Mr. Du Bois was one of the group of Negro civic leaders and intellectuals who joined with the white Niagara movement more than 50 years ago to organize the NAACP. For 25 years he served as editor of the NAACP magazine, the Crisis.

The award was given in the United States instead of Moscow at the insistence of Mr. Du Bois. In his acceptance speech, he explained he did not feel he could refuse the award but did not want to receive it in Russia.

Mr. Speaker, the statement is silent as to why Du Bois felt he could not refuse the award. There must have been some reason and we are left to our own conclusion. Obviously he felt and recognized a tie between himself and the Kremlin, as well as between his philosophy and that of Lenin; and the fact that he received the International Lenin Prize in the Russian Embassy here in Washington instead of in Russia does not cover up anything, as the recipient seemed to think it would.

STABILIZING MINING OF LEAD AND ZINC

MR. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 560) providing for the consideration of H.R. 8860, a bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8860) to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

MR. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]; and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution provides for an open rule, with 2 hours of general debate to discuss H.R. 8860, which is designed to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small producers. There is some controversy about the bill, but I know of no opposition to the rule.

I therefore reserve the balance of my time.

MR. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule which makes in order the consideration of H.R. 8860, a bill designed to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers on public, Indian, and other lands, and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I wish to compliment my good friend from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] for his untiring

efforts in behalf of the lead and zinc industry.

My home county of Jo Daviess, Ill., produces these two metals which are of vital importance to our country. For over a century and a half, lead and zinc have been mined in the territory of Galena, which means lead and which is my home city. In the War Between the States over 80 percent of the lead and zinc used by the Union forces was mined in the Galena, Ill., territory.

I need not tell you that the lead and zinc industry, especially east of the Mississippi River is in serious trouble. The production of small lead and zinc mines east of the Mississippi River has dropped from 31,618 tons in 1955 to 17,240 tons in 1958, and employment dropped from 700 to 400 workers. These small mines need help or they will all be obliged to shut down. Stabilization payments to mines east of the Mississippi under this bill would run to about \$800,000 a year during the present emergency, permitting increases in employment and generally benefiting the local communities.

Under the bill as amended payments would be made by the Department of the Interior to small lead and zinc producers at a rate which would provide them a return equivalent to that which they would receive if the market price for zinc were 14½ cents per pound. I believe most will agree that these prices are fair and reasonable. Current market prices are 13 cents for lead and 12 cents for zinc. I believe all agree that these prices are unreasonable.

MR. SPEAKER, I urge the approval of this rule and the passage of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

MR. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise in opposition to the rule. I rise to call the attention of the House to the fact that this bill is one, when it does come up for consideration, I believe every Member should study carefully, and not approve lightly in these last few remaining hours or minutes of today's session.

This bill, putting it bluntly and plainly, is a bill to pay subsidies, on the production of lead and zinc, to certain mines in the United States because we have not had the good sense and sound judgment to put the right kind of an import duty on foreign produced lead and zinc to protect American mines and American labor. We come to this situation because we have a Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, under which we cut down on import duties, and actually bring some foreign materials in free of charge, thus lowering the revenues to the Federal Treasury on the one hand only to turn around and to often pay subsidies to keep in operation some of the industries in the United States which are badly injured by foreign imports. It just does not make sense.

Let me say, in fairness to the lead and zinc mining industry of this country, that three different times the Tariff Commission tried to give relief to these industries, but was overridden. I am

June 30, 1960

HOUSE

14. SUGAR. By a vote of 395 to 0, passed with amendment H. R. 12311, to amend and extend the Sugar Act. See Digest 121 for a summary of the provisions of the bill as passed. pp. 14150-71
15. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11389 (pp. 14109-10). As agreed to the bill provides \$165,000, instead of \$40,000 as recommended by the House and \$350,000 as recommended by the Senate, for the President for expenses in improving the management of Federal agencies.
16. LABOR STANDARDS. By a vote of 341 to 72, passed with amendment H. R. 12677, to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (pp. 14110-50). By a vote of 211 to 203, agreed to an amendment by Rep. Kitchin in the nature of a substitute for the language of the bill as reported, which includes provisions to raise the minimum wage level to \$1.15 an hour (instead of \$1.25 an hour as reported), and to amend the Act to include employees engaged in "the processing of shade-grown tobacco for use as cigar wrapper tobacco by agricultural employees employed in the growing and harvesting of such tobacco, which processing shall include, but shall not be limited to, drying, during, fermenting, bulking, rebulking, sorting, grading, aging, and baling, prior to the stemming process." (pp. 14141-9).
17. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11776 (H. Rept. 2063). pp. 14202-4
18. PERSONNEL; PAY. Received from the President his veto message on H. R. 9883, the Federal pay raise bill (H. Doc. 442). pp. 14108-9
19. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. By a vote of 402 to 5, agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11998, and acted on the amendments in disagreement. pp. 14098-108
20. FOREST ROADS. Conferees were appointed on H. R. 10495, the road authorization bill, including appropriation authorizations for forest highways and forest roads and trails (p. 14108). Senate conferees have already been appointed.
21. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Received the conference report on this bill, H. R. 12231 (H. Rept. 2062). pp. 14201-2
22. FLOOD CONTROL. Received the conference report on H. R. 7634, the omnibus flood control and rivers and harbors bill (H. Rept. 2064). pp. 14204-11
23. HAWAII. Agreed to H. Con. Res. 706 authorizing corrections in the enrolled bill H. R. 11602, to amend certain laws of the U. S. in light of the admission of Hawaii into the Union. p. 14171
24. TRANSPORTATION. Received the conference report on H. R. 11135, to aid in the development of a coordinated system of transportation for the National Capital region; to create a temporary National Capital Transportation Agency; etc (H. Rept. 2061). pp. 14171-5
25. LIVESTOCK. Rep. Thomson, Wyo., urged consideration of legislation to "provide protection for producers and feeders of livestock when they show that the increased import of meat or meat products causes or threatens serious injury to their industry." p. 14177

26. RECLAMATION. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee reported without amendment S. 68, to provide for continued delivery of water under the Federal reclamation laws to lands held by husband and wife upon the death of either (H. Rept. 2055). p. 14211
27. CONSERVATION. The Conservation and Credit Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee voted to report to the full committee H. R. 12849, to protect farms and ranch operators making certain land use changes under the Great Plains conservation program and the soil bank program against loss of cropland acreage and acreage allotments. p. D643
28. WEEDS. The "Daily Digest" states that the Conservation and Credit Subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee "passed over without prejudice" S. 861, to provide for the control of noxious plants on land under the control or jurisdiction of the Federal Government." p. D643

ITEM IN APPENDIX

29. TEXTILE IMPORTS. Sen. Talmadge inserted an article criticizing a recent Tariff Commission decision regarding duties on textile imports which includes a statement by Sen. Thurmond that this "proves the imperative need of Congress to take action in the next session to regain control of its constitutional authority over our trade program." p. A5680

BILLS INTRODUCED

30. PERSONNEL. H. R. 12900, by Rep. Halpern, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize the retirement of employees after 30 years of service without reduction in annuity; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
H. R. 12903, by Rep. Short, to adjust the rates of compensation of employees in the postal field service, to establish a temporary Commission on Federal Civilian Employees Compensation Policy; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee.
31. SCHOOL LUNCH. H. R. 12896, by Rep. Bailey, to amend the National School Lunch Act to provide for a more equitable distribution of the funds available under such act; to Education and Labor Committee.
32. MARKETING. S. 3787, by Sen. Holland, to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, relating to practices in the marketing of perishable agricultural commodities; to Agriculture and Forestry Committee.
33. FOREST ROADS. S. 3791, by Sen. Magnuson, to amend section 205 of title 23 of the United States Code to provide for the system of forest development roads and trails needed for the utilization and protection of lands administered by the Forest Service; to Public Works Committee. Remarks of author. p. 13991

-0-

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ANNOUNCEMENTS:

July 1: Increased price supports for milk and butterfat, amendments to Public Law 480, protection of acreage allotments in Great Plains program, inclusion of administrative costs in crop insurance premiums, donation of dairy products for home economic courses, grading of grapes and plums for export, establishment of botanic garden in Hawaii, and miscellaneous land transfer bills, H. Agriculture (exec).

Road authorization bill, conferees (exec).

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961

JUNE 30, 1960.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. THOMAS, from the committee of conference,
submitted the following

CONFERENCE REPORT

[To accompany H.R. 11776]

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 7, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 45, 49, 54, 62, 74, and 75.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 21, 40, 41, 43, 48, 51, 57, 58, 60, 68, 69, 70, and 76, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert : *Provided, That contracts for not to exceed two persons under this appropriation for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be renewed annually, and one such contract, for the services of an expert or consultant for telecommunications, may provide for a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75; and the Senate agree to the same.*

Amendment numbered 5:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$16,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert , *of which not to exceed \$6,000,000 shall become available on January 1, 1961, for allocation to the States pursuant to section 205 of said Act*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$9,175,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$7,392,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$65,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$19,405,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$373,064,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13½:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13½, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the figure proposed by said amendment insert *six*; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$163,250,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$165,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$13,085,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$7,663,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$7,507,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$165,075,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$165,441,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$15,105,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$20,031,100; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$38,326,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$6,375,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$21,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$3,978,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$13,150,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$20,000,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$20,138,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$5,375,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$621,453,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert \$10,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$175,800,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$8,912,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$31,528,400; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$34,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$21,500,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$1,330,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$503,500; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert \$8,550,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 12, 18, 23, 44, 47, and 52.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
LISTER HILL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
GORDON ALLOTT,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

Amendment No. 1: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$24,700,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$25,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Deletes limitation language relating to the Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Committee as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Provides for the employment of two consultants instead of one as proposed by the House and four as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 5 and 6: Appropriate \$16,000,000 for the Federal contribution program instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$22,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide that \$6,000,000 shall not become available until January 1, 1961, for matching grants for personnel and administrative expenses of State and local civil defense organizations as authorized by section 205 of Public Law 85-606, instead of prohibiting funds for such purpose as proposed by the House and providing \$12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Deletes language proposed by the Senate relating to ratification of certain past expenditures under this appropriation head.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$9,175,000 for emergency supplies and equipment instead of \$6,950,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$7,392,500 for salaries and expenses instead of \$7,285,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$65,000,000 for payments to air carriers instead of \$60,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$68,984,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree with the statement contained in the Senate report relating to the need to reverse the trend of increased subsidy payments to air carriers. The Board should examine carefully and critically some of the administrative costs and allowances that make up expenses of the carriers. The amount of profit allowed the carriers by the Board is apparently being increased above the present 8-percent level. Careful consideration should be given to the granting of any increase, as other Government agencies allow only a 6-percent rate of return.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$19,405,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$19,230,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,580,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in disagreement.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$373,064,000 for operating expenses instead of \$365,245,000 as proposed by the House and \$380,883,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13½: Authorizes the purchase of six aircraft instead of five as proposed by the House and seven as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$163,250,000 for the establishment of air navigation facilities instead of \$152,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$174,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Amendment No. 15: Inserts travel limitation as proposed by the Senate and authorizes \$165,000 instead of \$172,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$13,085,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$12,935,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,135,000 as proposed by the Senate.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$7,663,500 for salaries and expenses instead of \$7,532,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,795,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$7,507,500 for salaries and expenses instead of \$7,415,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. Special attention should be given to textile labeling activities until the program gets organized.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$165,075,000 for operating expenses of the Public Buildings Service instead of \$160,850,000 as proposed by the House and \$169,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Inserts technical language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$165,441,000 for construction of public buildings projects instead of \$144,836,000 as proposed by the House and \$171,980,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24: Authorizes \$633,250 for the project at Camden, Ark., as proposed by the House instead of \$655,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Authorizes \$37,286,100 for the project at San Francisco, Calif., as proposed by the House instead of \$38,296,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Authorizes \$7,636,400 for the project at Hartford, Conn., as proposed by the House instead of \$7,816,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Authorizes \$1,094,000 for the project at Thomasville, Ga., as proposed by the House instead of \$1,119,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Authorizes \$284,750 for the project at Van Buren, Maine, as proposed by the House instead of \$297,550 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Authorizes \$254,150 for the project at Vanceboro, Maine, as proposed by the House instead of \$261,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Authorizes \$874,650 for the project at Detroit, Mich., as proposed by the House instead of \$895,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Authorizes \$586,500 for the project at Sweetgrass, Mont., as proposed by the House instead of \$615,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Authorizes \$3,224,050 for the project at Bismarck, N.Dak., as proposed by the House instead of \$3,283,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Authorizes \$3,867,700 for the project at Toledo, Ohio, as proposed by the House instead of \$3,980,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Authorizes \$9,587,150 for the project at Memphis, Tenn., as proposed by the House instead of \$10,167,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Authorizes \$282,200 for the project at Dayton, Wash., as proposed by the House instead of \$288,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Inserts Senate language and authorizes \$15,105,000 for Federal Office Building No. 8 in the District of Columbia instead of \$15,794,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Inserts Senate language and authorizes \$20,031,100 for Federal Office Building No. 9 in the District of Columbia instead of \$21,222,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Inserts Senate language and authorizes \$38,326,500 for Federal Office Building No. 10 in the District of Columbia instead of \$40,803,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Inserts Senate language and authorizes \$6,375,000 for the U.S. Court of Claims and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals Building in the District of Columbia instead of \$6,491,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Authorizes the limits of costs for a project to be exceeded by not to exceed 10 percent as proposed by the Senate instead of 5 percent as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41: Inserts Senate language in this paragraph, instead of under sites and expenses as proposed by the House, authorizing \$5,500,000 for the project at Chicago, Ill.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$21,000,000 for sites and expenses for public buildings projects instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Deletes House language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 45: Deletes item proposed by the Senate for \$3,800,000 for the construction of relocation facilities.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$3,978,000 for operating expenses of the Federal Supply Service instead of \$3,716,500 as proposed by the House and \$4,240,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 48: Deletes language requiring certain miscellaneous reimbursements to be promptly deposited into the Treasury as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Deletes Senate language for an appropriation of \$100,000 for the working capital fund.

Amendment No. 50: Authorizes \$13,150,000 for the administrative operations fund instead of \$13,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Strikes out language relating to extension and conversion projects as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Reported in disagreement. The language proposed by the Senate relative to allowing local governmental units a reasonable period of time in which to perfect a comprehensive and coordinated plan of use and procurement for surplus real estate and buildings is not a direction for the General Services Administration to take just any price for such properties.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$20,000,000 for housing for the elderly instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54: Deletes Senate language earmarking \$150,000 for housing for the benefit of elderly persons who are members of an Indian tribe.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$20,138,500 for salaries and expenses instead of \$19,777,000 as proposed by the House and \$20,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Amendment No. 56: Authorizes \$5,375,000 for expenses of travel instead of \$4,900,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,849,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57: Appropriates \$170,760,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$166,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 58: Authorizes the purchase of 60 passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of 45 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates \$621,453,000 for research and development instead of \$602,240,000 as proposed by the House and \$671,453,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Appropriates \$122,787,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$107,275,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 61: Inserts Senate language and authorizes \$10,000 for scientific consultations and any emergency or extraordinary expense instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the Senate.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

Amendment No. 62: Restores House language providing an appropriation of \$40,000 for operation and maintenance of properties.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates \$175,800,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$160,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$191,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates \$8,912,500 for salaries and expenses instead of \$8,525,000 as proposed by the House and \$9,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

Amendment No. 65: Appropriates \$31,528,400 for salaries and expenses instead of \$30,278,400 as proposed by the House and \$32,778,400 as proposed by the Senate.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

Amendments Nos. 66 and 67: Appropriate \$34,500,000 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses instead of \$30,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$39,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and earmark \$21,500,000 for medical research instead of \$17,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$26,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Amendment No. 68: Authorizes \$8,341,000 for nonadministrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,141,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 69: Authorizes \$800,000 for administrative expenses of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as proposed by the Senate instead of \$787,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 70: Deletes House language placing a limitation on nonadministrative expenses of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as proposed by the Senate.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

Amendment No. 71: Authorizes \$1,330,000 for administrative expenses for college housing loans instead of \$1,260,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 72: Authorizes \$503,500 for administrative expenses for public facility loans instead of \$477,000 as proposed by the House and \$530,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73: Authorizes \$8,550,000 for administrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration instead of \$8,450,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74: Restores House language authorizing \$50,000,000 for nonadministrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration instead of language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 75: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to authorize nonadministrative expenses for the Federal Housing Administration up to 15 percent in excess of the amount specified in the bill on a contingent basis.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 76: Deletes House language as proposed by the Senate requiring that committees of expert examiners and boards of civil service examiners be included within the limitation on employees engaged in personnel work.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

S. 2566. An act for the relief of Peter Leo Bahr, John Trevor Jefferies, Charnian Candy Jefferies, and Stephen Reid Jefferies;

S. 2740. An act for the relief of Julia Sukkar;

S. 2941. An act for the relief of Ming-Chen Hsu; and

S. 3179. An act to increase the authorization for appropriations for construction of facilities for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 2584. An act for the relief of Gourgen H. Assaturian;

H.R. 2665. An act for the relief of Briccio Garces de Castro;

H.R. 2671. An act for the relief of Antonia Martinez;

H.R. 2823. An act for the relief of Fumie Yoshioka;

H.R. 3122. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a homestead patent to the heirs of Frank L. Wilhelm;

H.R. 3291. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to certain medals;

H.R. 3534. An act for the relief of Epifanio Trupiano;

H.R. 3789. An act for the relief of Preciolita V. Coriass (nee Preciolita Valera);

H.R. 3805. An act for the relief of Religiosa Liugia Frizzo, Religiosa Vittoria Garzoni, Religiosa Marie Ramus, Religiosa Ines Ferrardio, and Religiosa Roberta Ciccone;

H.R. 3923. An act to provide for the presentation of medal to persons who have served as members of the U.S. expedition to Antarctica;

H.R. 4346. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act to limit the use of false financial statements as a bar to discharge;

H.R. 4670. An act for the relief of Karnali Singh Mahal;

H.R. 5569. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of certain medals within 2 years after a determination by the Secretary concerned that because of loss or inadvertence the recommendation was not processed;

H.R. 6108. An act to provide for the establishment of the Arkansas Post National Memorial in the State of Arkansas;

H.R. 7726. An act to amend section 678 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 1078) relating to the transmission of petitions, notices, orders, and other papers to the Secretary of the Treasury in chapter XIII proceedings;

H.R. 7932. An act for the relief of William E. Dulin;

H.R. 7965. An act to amend section 612 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize outpatient treatment incident to authorized hospital care for certain veterans;

H.R. 8212. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the procedure for ordering certain members of the reserve components to active duty and the requirements for physical examination of members of the reserve components, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8253. An act for the relief of Pierre R. DeBroux;

H.R. 8740. An act to provide for the leasing of oil and gas interests in certain lands owned by the United States in the State of Texas;

H.R. 9142. An act to provide for payment for lands heretofore conveyed to the United States as a basis for lieu selections from the public domain, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9201. An act to validate certain mining claims in California;

H.R. 9541. An act to amend section 109(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949;

H.R. 9711. An act for the relief of Robert L. Stoermer;

H.R. 9751. An act for the relief of Mrs. Icile Heien Hinman;

H.R. 10021. An act providing a uniform law for the transfer of securities to and by fiduciaries in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 10068. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11001. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association;

H.R. 11522. An act to amend the act of August 26, 1935, to permit certain real property of the United States to be conveyed to States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions for highway purposes;

H.R. 11787. An act to authorize a continuation of flight instruction for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps until August 1, 1964;

H.R. 12052. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, for an additional 2 years;

H.R. 12265. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize certain persons to administer oaths and to perform notarial acts for persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States;

H.R. 12346. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury;

H.R. 12570. An act to amend section 303(c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 by imposing certain limitations on the transportation of household effects; and

H.J. Res. 627. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations incident to U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted the following conference report and statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2062)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12231) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 9 and 10.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, and 8, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$148,407,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$162,519,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$609,501,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1 and 5.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JOHN STENNIS,
DENNIS CHAVEZ,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLES BRIDGES (I.S.),

Managers on the Part of the House.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12231) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Amendment No. 1—Military construction: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 2—Military construction, Army: Appropriates \$148,407,000 instead of \$147,042,000 as proposed by the House and \$169,816,000 as proposed by the Senate.

The conferees have approved the items as proposed by the House with the reductions as proposed by the Senate and the following additional items:

Army:

Aberdeen Proving Ground, Md.:	
Station hospital-----	\$2,745,000
Hospital heating plant-----	155,000
White Sands missile range, N. Mex.: Electric power installation-----	960,000
Atlanta General Depot, Ga.:	
Aircraft maintenance shop--	365,000
Fort Monmouth, N.J.: Climatic test chamber-----	550,000
Fort Eustis, Va.:	
Barracks-----	384,000
Training command headquarters building-----	711,000
Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia: Service building-----	788,000
Fort Benning, Ga.:	
Battalion headquarters and classroom buildings-----	552,000
Dispensary and dental clinic-----	384,000
Fort Rucker, Ala.: Aircraft facilities-----	1,685,000
Fort Bliss, Tex., BOQ-----	1,283,000
Fort Sill, Okla.:	
BOQ-----	2,379,000
Electrical facilities-----	186,000
Fort Leavenworth, Kans.: BOQ--	329,000

The conferees are in agreement that the funds approved for Fort Rucker, Ala., are to be used to complete auxiliary field number 3 before utilizing any funds for the initiation of construction on any other auxiliary field.

Amendment No. 3—Military construction, Navy: Appropriates \$162,519,000 instead of \$156,459,000 as proposed by the House and \$166,583,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have approved the items as proposed by the House with the reductions as

proposed by the Senate and the following additional items:

Navy:

NOBSY, Flagstaff, Ariz.: Tele-scope facility-----	\$1,900,000
NS, San Diego, Calif.: Nuclear submarine pier-----	1,700,000
MCRD, Parris Island, S.C.: Recruit barracks-----	1,203,000
MCS, Quantico, Va.: Combat conditioning facilities-----	505,000
NSC, Athens, Ga.: Dispensary and lund-----	193,000
NTC, Great Lakes, Ill.: Recruit barracks-----	1,192,000

Amendment No. 4.—Military construction, Air Force: Appropriates \$609,501,000 instead of \$518,644,000 as proposed by the House and \$656,400,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have approved the items as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have approved the items as proposed by the House with the reductions as proposed by the Senate and the following additional items:

Air Force:

Maintenance docks-----	\$7,531,000
Titan facilities-----	70,000,000
Hanscom Field, Mass.: Elec-tronic laboratory-----	870,000
Kirtland AFB, N. Mex.: Nuclear warfare laboratory-----	1,580,000
Keesler AFB, Miss.: Technical training facilities-----	2,430,000
Lackland AFB, Tex.: Dormi-tories-----	1,443,000
Moody AFB, Ga.: Shop and training facilities-----	1,389,000
Reese AFB, Tex.: Flight simu-lator training facility-----	268,000
Gunter AFB, Ala.: Dormitory--	376,000
Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Dormitory--	423,000
Dow AFB, Maine: Medical facility-----	1,787,000
Francis E. Warren AFB, Wyo.: Apron rehabilitation-----	445,000
Crystal Springs, Miss.: Family housing-----	459,000
Rehabilitation of family hous-ing-----	500,000
Howard AFB, Canal Zone-----	1,553,000
Bomarc support facilities-----	2,500,000

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

Amendment No. 5.—Military construction, Air Force: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 6.—Military construction, Army Reserve: Appropriates \$16,038,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$12,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7.—Military construction, Army National Guard: Appropriates \$17,540,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8.—Military construction, Air National Guard: Appropriates \$13,850,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$7,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 9.—General provisions: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10.—General provisions: Changes section number.

HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES R. JONAS,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS submitted the following conference report and statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2063)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry

independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 7, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 45, 49, 54, 62, 74, and 75.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 21, 40, 41, 43, 48, 51, 57, 58, 60, 68, 69, 70, and 76, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert: "Provided, That contracts for not to exceed two persons under this appropriation for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be renewed annually, and one such contract, for the services of an expert or consultant for telecommunications, may provide for a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$16,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment insert "of which not to exceed \$6,000,000 shall become available on January 1, 1961, for allocation to the States pursuant to section 205 of said Act"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$9,175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,392,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$65,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$19,405,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$373,064,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13½: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13½, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure proposed by said amendment insert "six"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$163,250,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$165,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$13,085,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,663,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$7,507,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$165,075,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$165,441,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$15,105,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$20,031,100"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$38,326,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$6,375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,000,000"; and the Senate agree to same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,978,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$13,150,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$20,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$20,138,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$621,453,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 61: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 61, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 63: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$175,800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,912,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$31,528,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$34,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$21,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,330,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$503,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,550,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 12, 18, 23, 44, 47, and 52.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HAROLD C. OSTERAG,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
LISTER HILL,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
GORDON ALLOTT,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

TITLE I

Executive Office of the President

Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization

Amendment No. 1: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 2: Appropriates \$24,700,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the House instead of \$25,200,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3: Deletes limitation language relating to the Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Committee as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4: Provides for the employment of 2 consultants instead of one as proposed by the House and four as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 5 and 6: Appropriate \$16,000,000 for the Federal contribution program instead of \$10,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$22,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and provide that \$6,000,000 shall not become available until January 1, 1961, for matching grants for personnel and administrative expenses of State and local civil defense organizations as authorized by section 205 of Public Law 85-606, instead of prohibiting funds for such purpose as proposed by the House and providing \$12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Deletes language proposed by the Senate relating to ratification of certain past expenditures under this appropriation head.

Amendment No. 8: Appropriates \$9,175,000 for emergency supplies and equipment instead of \$6,950,000 as proposed by the House and \$11,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Independent offices

Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 9: Appropriates \$7,392,500 for salaries and expenses instead of \$7,285,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates \$65,000,000 for payments to air carriers instead of \$60,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$68,984,000 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees agree with the statement contained

in the Senate report relating to the need to reverse the trend of increased subsidy payments to air carriers. The Board should examine carefully and critically some of the administrative costs and allowances that make up expenses of the carriers. The amount of profit allowed the carriers by the Board is apparently being increased above the present 8 percent level. Careful consideration should be given to the granting of any increase, as other Government agencies allow only a 6 percent rate of return.

Civil Service Commission

Amendment No. 11: Appropriates \$19,405,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$19,230,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,580,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12: Reported in disagreement.

Federal Aviation Agency

Amendment No. 13: Appropriates \$373,064,000 for operating expenses instead of \$365,245,000 as proposed by the House and \$380,883,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13½: Authorizes the purchase of six aircraft instead of five as proposed by the House and seven as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14: Appropriates \$163,250,000 for the establishment of air navigation facilities instead of \$152,500,000 as proposed by the House and \$174,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Communications Commission

Amendment No. 15: Inserts travel limitation as proposed by the Senate and authorizes \$165,000 instead of \$172,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Appropriates \$13,085,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$12,935,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,135,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Federal Power Commission

Amendment No. 17: Appropriates \$7,663,500 for salaries and expenses instead of \$7,532,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,795,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18: Reported in disagreement.

Federal Trade Commission

Amendment No. 19: Appropriates \$7,507,500 for salaries and expenses instead of \$7,415,000 as proposed by the House and \$7,600,000 as proposed by the Senate. Special attention should be given to textile-labeling activities until the program gets organized.

General Services Administration

Amendment No. 20: Appropriates \$165,075,000 for operating expenses of the Public Buildings Service instead of \$160,850,000 as proposed by the House and \$169,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 21: Inserts technical language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 22: Appropriates \$165,441,000 for construction of public buildings projects instead of \$144,836,000 as proposed by the House and \$171,980,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 24: Authorizes \$633,250 for the project at Camden, Arkansas, as proposed by the House instead of \$655,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25: Authorizes \$37,286,100 for the project at San Francisco, California, as proposed by the House instead of \$38,296,900 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26: Authorizes \$7,636,400 for the project at Hartford, Connecticut, as proposed by the House instead of \$7,816,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27: Authorizes \$1,094,000 for the project at Thomasville, Georgia, as proposed by the House instead of \$1,119,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28: Authorizes \$284,750 for the project at Van Buren, Maine, as proposed by the House instead of \$297,550 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 29: Authorizes \$254,150 for the project at Vanceboro, Maine, as proposed by the House instead of \$261,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 30: Authorizes \$874,650 for the project at Detroit, Michigan, as proposed by the House instead of \$895,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31: Authorizes \$586,500 for the project at Sweetgrass, Montana, as proposed by the House instead of \$615,600 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 32: Authorizes \$3,224,050 for the project at Bismarck, North Dakota, as proposed by the House instead of \$3,283,050 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: Authorizes \$3,867,700 for the project at Toledo, Ohio, as proposed by the House instead of \$3,930,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34: Authorizes \$9,587,150 for the project at Memphis, Tennessee, as proposed by the House instead of \$10,167,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 35: Authorizes \$282,200 for the project at Dayton, Washington, as proposed by the House instead of \$288,700 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 36: Inserts Senate language and authorizes \$15,105,000 for Federal Office Building Numbered Eight in the District of Columbia instead of \$15,794,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 37: Inserts Senate language and authorizes \$20,031,100 for Federal Office Building Numbered Nine in the District of Columbia instead of \$21,222,100 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 38: Inserts Senate language and authorizes \$38,326,500 for Federal Office Building Numbered Ten in the District of Columbia instead of \$40,803,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 39: Inserts Senate language and authorizes \$6,375,000 for the United States Court of Claims and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals building in the District of Columbia instead of \$6,491,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 40: Authorizes the limits of costs for a project to be exceeded by not to exceed 10 per centum as proposed by the Senate instead of 5 per centum as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 41: Inserts Senate language in this paragraph, instead of under sites and expenses as proposed by the House, authorizing \$5,500,000 for the project at Chicago, Illinois.

Amendment No. 42: Appropriates \$21,000,000 for sites and expenses for public buildings projects instead of \$25,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$19,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 43: Deletes House language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 44: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 45: Deletes item proposed by the Senate for \$3,800,000 for the construction of relocation facilities.

Amendment No. 46: Appropriates \$3,978,000 for operating expenses of the Federal Supply Service instead of \$3,716,500 as proposed by the House and \$4,240,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 47: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 48: Deletes language requiring certain miscellaneous reimbursements to be promptly deposited into the Treasury as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 49: Deletes Senate language for an appropriation of \$100,000 for the working capital fund.

Amendment No. 50: Authorizes \$13,150,000 for the administrative operations fund instead of \$13,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$13,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 51: Strikes out language relating to extension and conversion projects as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 52: Reported in disagreement. The language proposed by the Senate relative to allowing local governmental units a reasonable period of time in which to perfect a comprehensive and coordinated plan of use and procurement for surplus real estate and buildings is not a direction for the General Services Administration to take just any price for such properties.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 53: Appropriates \$20,000,000 for housing for the elderly instead of \$5,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 54: Deletes Senate language earmarking \$150,000 for housing for the benefit of elderly persons who are members of an Indian tribe.

Interstate Commerce Commission

Amendment No. 55: Appropriates \$20,138,500 for salaries and expenses instead of \$19,777,000 as proposed by the House and \$20,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Aeronautics and Space Administration

Amendment No. 56: Authorizes \$5,375,000 for expenses for travel instead of \$4,900,000 as proposed by the House and \$5,849,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57: Approximates \$170,760,000 for salaries and expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$166,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 58: Authorizes the purchase of sixty passenger motor vehicles as proposed by the Senate instead of forty-five as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 59: Appropriates \$621,453,000 for research and development instead of \$602,240,000 as proposed by the House and \$671,453,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 60: Appropriates \$122,787,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$107,275,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 61: Inserts Senate language and authorizes \$10,000 for scientific consultations and any emergency or extraordinary expense instead of \$20,000 as proposed by the Senate.

National Capital Housing Authority

Amendment No. 62: Restores House language providing an appropriation of \$40,000 for operation and maintenance of properties.

National Science Foundation

Amendment No. 63: Appropriates \$175,800,000 for salaries and expenses instead of \$160,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$191,600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Securities and Exchange Commission

Amendment No. 64: Appropriates \$8,912,500 for salaries and expenses instead of \$8,525,000 as proposed by the House and \$9,300,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Selective Service System

Amendment No. 65: Appropriates \$31,528,400 for salaries and expenses instead of \$30,278,400 as proposed by the House and \$32,778,400 as proposed by the Senate.

Veterans' Administration

Amendments Nos. 66 and 67: Appropriate \$34,500,000 for medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses instead of \$30,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$39,000,000 as proposed by the Senate; and earmark \$21,500,000 for medical research instead of \$17,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$26,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

Federal Home Loan Bank Board

Amendment No. 68: Authorizes \$8,341,000 for nonadministrative expenses as proposed by the Senate instead of \$8,141,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 69: Authorizes \$800,000 for administrative expenses of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as proposed by the Senate instead of \$787,500 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 70: Deletes House language placing a limitation on nonadministrative expenses of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation as proposed by the Senate.

Housing and Home Finance Agency

Amendment No. 71: Authorizes \$1,330,000 for administrative expenses for college housing loans instead of \$1,260,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,400,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 72: Authorizes \$503,500 for administrative expenses for public facility loans instead of \$477,000 as proposed by the House and \$530,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 73: Authorizes \$8,550,000 for administrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration instead of \$8,450,000 as proposed by the House and \$8,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 74: Restores House language authorizing \$50,000,000 for nonadministrative expenses of the Federal Housing Administration instead of language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 75: Deletes language proposed by the Senate to authorize nonadministrative expenses for the Federal Housing Administration up to 15 per centum in excess of the amount specified in the bill on a contingent basis.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 76: Deletes House language as proposed by the Senate requiring that committees of expert examiners and boards of civil service examiners be included within the limitation on employees engaged in personnel work.

ALBERT THOMAS,
SIDNEY R. YATES,
CLARENCE CANNON,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee submitted the following conference report and statement:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2064)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7634) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 24, 75, 101, 102, 103, 104, 124, 138, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, and 162.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 76,

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND FINANCE

(For Department
Staff Only)

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

CONTENTS

Issued July 5, 1960
For actions of July 1, 1960
86th-2d, No. 123

Acreage allotments.....	41
Administrative practices.....	35
Appropriations 1,2,3,5,7,10,40,43	
ARS.....	1
Banking.....	49
Botanic garden.....	19
Budget.....	33
Casein imports.....	44
Coconut meat.....	26
Color additives.....	13
Conservation.....	19
Contracts.....	17
Cotton.....	48
Crop insurance.....	19
Defense production.....	42
Depressed areas.....	25
Electrification.....	27
Entomology.....	1
Farm program.....	32
Flood control.....1,12,22	
Food supply.....	31
Foreign affairs.....	47
Forest highways.....1,18	
Grapes and plums.....	19
Great Plains.....	19

Hawaii.....	9
Household effects.....	45
Industrial loans.....	25
Lands.....	8,19
Library services.....	28
Military construction.....	10
Organization.....	24
Pay increase.....	1,6
Personnel.....	1,6,38
Potatoes.....	29
Poultry food.....	1
Procurement.....	37
Property.....	21
Public debt.....	46
Public health.....	16
Purchasing.....	17
Reclamation.....	14
Recreation.....	23
Roads and trails.....	18
Small business.....	15
Social security.....	34
Soil bank.....	19
Sugar.....	4,36
Supplemental appropriations.....	1
Surplus food.....	39
Taxation.....	33
Trade agreements.....	34
Transportation.....	11
Water research.....	30
Watersheds.....	1,20
Wool imports.....	50

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate passed supplemental appropriation bill. Senate committee reported resolution to adjust sugar quotas. Both Houses agreed to conference reports and cleared for President: Independent offices appropriation bill; legislative branch appropriation bill. Senate agreed to conference report on general Government matters appropriation bill. Both Houses passed appropriation continuation measure. Both Houses overrode President's veto of pay raise bill. House received conference report on road authorization bill, including forest roads. House committee voted to report bill to permit inclusion of administrative costs in crop insurance premiums.

SENATE

1. SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. By a vote of 90 to 2, passed with amendments this bill, H. R. 12740 (pp. 14378-80). The bill had been reported earlier by the Appropriations Committee with amendments (S. Rept. 1832) (p. 14378). Agreed to the following committee amendments: To strike out \$500,000 to ARS for the construction of an entomology laboratory and insert \$5,200,000 to ARS for the construction of facilities; to provide to SCS \$1,800,000 additional for watershed protection and \$1,570,000 for flood prevention; to provide \$1,350,000 addition to AMS to permit inspection of poultry-food products in processing plants during fiscal year 1961; and to provide \$30,000,000 to the

Bureau of Public Roads for payment of obligations incurred in the construction of forest highways. p. 14378

Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Hayden to provide that appropriations, authorizations, and funds available to departments and agencies for the fiscal year 1961 may be apportioned on the basis indicating the need for supplemental estimates so as to permit the payment of pay increases provided for in new pay raise law. p. 14379

Agreed to an amendment by Sen. Johnson to provide \$5,031,000 for construction of an international storage dam on the Rio Grande by the U. S. and Mexico. (p. 14379). Conferees were appointed. p. 14380

2. INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1961. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11776, and acted on amendments in disagreement. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 14294-6, 14309-12
3. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 11389, and acted on amendments in disagreement. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 14297
4. SUGAR. The Finance Committee reported without amendment S. J. Res. 217, to authorize the President to make certain adjustments in the sugar quotas for foreign countries (S. Rept. 1833). p. 14215
Sen. Long, Hawaii, inserted a newspaper editorial, "Sugar as a Foreign Policy Instrument," discussing the proposed legislation to give the President authority to adjust foreign sugar quotas. p. 14226
5. LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 12232, with the Senate agreeing to recede from the remaining amendment of the Senate in disagreement. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 14297-9, 14341
6. PERSONNEL; PAY RAISE. Both Houses voted to override the President's veto of H. R. 9883, the pay raise bill for Federal employees (the House by a vote of 345 to 69, and the Senate by a vote of 74 to 24). The bill now becomes law. pp. 14307-8, 14264, 14265-6, 14275-92 (Public Law 86-568)
7. TEMPORARAY APPROPRIATIONS. Both Houses passed without amendment H. J. Res. 778, the appropriations continuation resolution to make temporary appropriations until Aug. 31, 1960, to those departments and agencies whose annual appropriation bills have not yet been enacted. This measure will now be sent to the President. pp. 14293, 14307-8
8. LANDS. Passed with amendment S. 2587, to require an act of Congress for public land withdrawals in excess of 5,000 acres in the aggregate for any project or facility of any department or agency of the Government. pp. 14416-7
Passed with amendments H. R. 7004, to permit consistent practices in the management of all Bureau of Land Management lands so far as investigations, cooperative agreements, and acceptance of contributions are concerned. pp. 14428-9
9. HAWAII. Agreed to H. Con. Res. 706, authorizing certain correction in the enrolling of H. R. 11602, to amend certain laws in light of the admission of Hawaii into the Union. p. 14268
10. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961. Both Houses agreed to the conference report on this bill, H. R. 12231, and acted on amendments in disagreement. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 14293-4, 14308-9

H.R. 9715. An act for the relief of Otis Drinkard;
 H.R. 10152. An act for the relief of Miss Marie E. Mark;
 H.R. 10532. An act for the relief of Carmelo Spagnoletti;
 H.R. 11128. An act for the relief of Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann and family;
 H.R. 11327. An act for the relief of Chauncey A. Ahalt;
 H.R. 11420. An act for the relief of Ferdinand Hofacker;
 H.R. 11460. An act for the relief of Edouard E. Perret;
 H.R. 11545. An act to amend the act of October 31, 1949, with respect to payments to Bernalillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care for certain Indians;
 H.R. 11562. An act for the relief of the Maritime Museum Association of San Diego;
 H.R. 11756. An act for the relief of Cato Bros., Inc.
 H.R. 11791. An act to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Paul Bernstein against the United States;
 H.R. 12398. An act for the relief of Erwin P. Milspaugh;
 H.R. 12471. An act for the relief of Capt. Lucien B. Clark, O2051623, MSC, U.S. Army;
 H.R. 12476. An act for the relief of John H. Esterline; and
 H.R. 12617. An act for the relief of Robert Finley Delaney.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 2069. An act for the relief of James H. Presley;
 H.R. 5284. An act for the relief of Christine Fahrenbruch, a minor;
 H.R. 6084. An act for the relief of J. Butler Hyde;
 H.R. 6709. An act for the relief of Mike H. Kostelac;
 H.R. 6767. An act for the relief of Raymond Baurkot;
 H.R. 7035. An act for the relief of Hattie and Joseph Patrick, Sr., and for the legal guardian of Betty Ann Smith and the legal guardian of Stanley Smith, and for the legal guardian of James E. Harris, Jr.;
 H.R. 7618. An act for the relief of H.P. Lambert Co., Inc., and Southeastern Drilling Corp.;
 H.R. 7792. An act for the relief of Martin A. Mastandrea;
 H.R. 9417. An act for the relief of Harry Kaloian;
 H.R. 9715. An act for the relief of Otis Drinkard;
 H.R. 10152. An act for the relief of Miss Marie E. Mark;
 H.R. 10532. An act for the relief of Carmelo Spagnoletti;
 H.R. 11128. An act for the relief of Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann and family;
 H.R. 11327. An act for the relief of Chauncey A. Ahalt;
 H.R. 11420. An act for the relief of Ferdinand Hofacker;
 H.R. 11460. An act for the relief of Edouard E. Perret;
 H.R. 11562. An act for the relief of the Maritime Museum Association of San Diego;
 H.R. 11756. An act for the relief of Cato Bros., Inc.;
 H.R. 11791. An act to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Paul Bernstein against the United States;
 H.R. 12398. An act for the relief of Erwin P. Milspaugh;
 H.R. 12471. An act for the relief of Capt. Lucien B. Clark, O2051623, MSC, U.S. Army;

H.R. 12476. An act for the relief of John H. Esterline; and

H.R. 12617. An act for the relief of Robert Finley Delaney; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 11545. An act to amend the act of October 31, 1949, with respect to payments to Bernalillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care for certain Indians; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TEMPORARY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to inform the Senate that the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has a House joint resolution concerning appropriation bills that he desires to present. I should like to yield to him at this time to offer that resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 778, the joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the months of July and August.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 778), making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1961, and for other purposes was read twice by its title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is no objection to its immediate consideration, but only to make the record, as these bills are signed by the President from time to time, the joint resolution will have no application; the joint resolution is intended only for carryover purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. It would carry over as to the operations specified, and when the President signs any one of the bills concerned, the joint resolution will no longer apply to that bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. This joint resolution is the usual type, in order to make provision for continuing in operation the functions of Government for which annual appropriations for fiscal year 1961 have not been enacted. The joint resolution will continue its function until August 31, 1960.

The joint resolution covers the following appropriation bills: Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1961; General Government Matters Appropriation Act, 1961; Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1961; Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1961; Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Act, 1961; Military Construction Appropriation Act, 1961; Mutual Security and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1961; Public Works Appropriation Act, 1961; Departments of State and Justice, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, 1961;

and the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 778) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has a conference report that is noncontroversial which he wishes to present. I think it can be disposed of in a relatively short time. Then the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has a conference report that is very important and I understand it is also noncontroversial and can be disposed of within a short time. First we should like to lay before the Senate the conference report on the military construction bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12231) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of June 30, 1960, p. 14201, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the report is unanimous and is signed by all conferees. I ask that it be adopted.

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.
 Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.
 Mr. SALTONSTALL. I support entirely the statement of the Senator from Mississippi. The conference report was unanimously agreed to. It was arrived at after about 6 hours of labor. I believe it is a proper report for this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the amount of the budget estimate, the amounts contained in the House and the Senate versions, and the final amount for each item in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Appropriations for military construction, fiscal year 1961, showing 1960 appropriations, 1961 estimates, and congressional action

Title (1)	Appropriations, 1960 (2)	Budget esti- mate, 1961 (3)	House action (4)	Senate action (5)	Conference action (6)
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Military construction, Army.....	\$263,632,300	\$209,000,000	\$147,042,000	\$169,816,000	\$148,407,000
Military construction, Army Reserve.....	20,000,000	12,000,000	12,000,000	16,038,000	16,038,000
Military construction, Army National Guard.....	23,219,000	8,000,000	8,000,000	17,540,000	17,540,000
Military construction, Army (special foreign currency program).....		2,000,000			
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY					
Military construction, Navy.....	204,112,400	190,000,000	156,459,000	166,583,000	162,519,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve.....	8,980,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Military construction, Navy (special foreign currency program).....		3,000,000			
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE					
Military construction, Air Force.....	776,832,500	725,000,000	518,644,000	656,400,000	609,501,000
Military construction, Air Force Reserve.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Military construction, Air Force National Guard.....	16,440,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	13,850,000	13,850,000
Military construction, Air Force (special foreign currency program).....		4,000,000			
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE					
Loran stations, Department of Defense.....	23,200,000	20,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000	19,000,000
Military construction, Advanced Re- search Projects Agency, Department of Defense.....				1 (20,000,000)	(20,000,000)
Total.....	1,340,416,200	1,188,000,000	876,145,000	1,067,227,000	994,856,000

¹ \$20,000,000 to be derived by transfer from funds available to Office of Secretary of Defense for advanced research projects.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of June 30, 1960, pp. 14202-14203, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 11776, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.

July 1, 1960.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 12, 18, 23, 44, and 52 to the bill (H.R. 11776) entitled "An Act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and officers, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes", and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named therein, insert "\$2,500".

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the word "transferred" insert "without reimbursement".

Independent offices appropriation bill, 1961

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES

Item	Appropriations, 1960 ¹	Budget esti- mates, 1961	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT					
OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$29,535,000	\$25,750,000	\$24,700,000	\$25,200,000	\$24,700,000
Civil defense and defense mobilization functions of Federal agencies.....		10,000,000	6,250,000	6,250,000	6,250,000
Federal contributions.....	10,000,000	22,000,000	10,000,000	22,000,000	16,000,000
Emergency supplies and equipment.....	6,950,000	11,400,000	6,950,000	11,400,000	9,175,000
Research and development.....	4,000,000	7,200,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Construction of facilities.....	2,400,000				
Total, Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.....	52,885,000	76,350,000	51,900,000	68,850,000	60,125,000

Footnote at end of table.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate amendments numbered 1 and 47.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. For the purpose of the RECORD, this report is a unanimous concurrence of all conferees from both the House and the Senate. There are several important matters in this huge appropriation bill in which the Senate was interested and with respect to which it instructed the conferees before they went to conference. Among those is the matter of the appropriation for the civil defense program of matching funds for State and local administrative costs. We have agreed upon \$6 million, which is one-half of the \$12 million requested, and the program is scheduled to begin January 1.

Provided for the General Services Administration for the construction of public buildings throughout the country is \$165,441,000. It also includes the construction of four large buildings in the District of Columbia, and the Court of Claims and the Court of Customs Appeals.

Restored to the Federal Communications Commission is \$150,000 for enlarging the investigation of stations as to technical and legal requirements with respect to their licenses. The Senate added \$50 million to begin the program for housing for the elderly, after the House had put in only \$5 million, over the opposition of the Federal Housing Administration itself, but we finally decided in conference to provide \$20 million for housing for the elderly, to get the program off the ground and started.

Provided is \$915 million, for the full budget estimate, for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Provided for medical research in the Veterans' Administration is \$4,500,000 of additional money, making \$21,500,000 earmarked for 1961.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a table showing comparative action on all items in the bill.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Independent offices appropriation bill, 1961—Continued

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1960 ¹	Budget esti- mates, 1961	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
INDEPENDENT OFFICES					
CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$6,925,000	\$7,600,000	\$7,285,000	\$7,500,000	\$7,392,500
Payments to air carriers (liquidation of contract authorization).....	58,500,000	68,984,000	60,000,000	68,984,000	65,000,000
Total, Civil Aeronautics Board.....	65,425,000	76,584,000	67,285,000	76,484,000	72,392,500
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	19,120,000	20,030,000	19,230,000	19,580,000	19,405,000
Investigation of U.S. citizens for employment by international organizations.....	400,000	467,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
Annuities under special acts.....	2,450,000	2,316,000	2,316,000	2,316,000	2,316,000
Government payment for annuitants, employees health benefits fund.....		2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Payment to civil service retirement and disability fund.....		46,329,000	46,329,000	46,329,000	46,329,000
Administrative expenses, Employees' Life Insurance Fund (limitation).....	(249,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)	(250,000)
Total, Civil Service Commission.....	21,970,000	71,642,000	70,775,000	71,125,000	70,950,000
FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY					
Expenses.....	318,700,000	383,000,000	365,245,000	380,883,000	373,064,000
Establishment of air navigation facilities.....	118,200,000	174,000,000	152,500,000	174,000,000	163,250,000
Grants-in-aid for airports (liquidation of contract authorization).....	57,500,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000	80,000,000
Research and development.....	48,725,000	65,000,000	64,900,000	64,000,000	64,000,000
Operation and maintenance, National Capital airports.....		6,000,000			
Operation and maintenance, Washington National Airport.....	2,400,000		3,230,000	3,230,000	3,230,000
Operation and maintenance, Dulles International Airport.....			2,450,000	2,450,000	2,450,000
Construction, Washington National Airport.....		5,000,000	4,500,000	4,500,000	4,500,000
Construction and development, additional Washington Airport.....	22,470,000				
Total, Federal Aviation Agency.....	567,995,000	713,000,000	671,925,000	709,063,000	690,494,000
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	10,550,000	13,500,000	12,935,000	13,135,000	13,085,000
FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	7,218,000	7,795,000	7,532,000	7,795,000	7,663,500
FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	6,840,000	7,600,000	7,415,000	7,600,000	7,507,500
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses.....	41,800,000	41,150,000	41,150,000	41,150,000	41,150,000
GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION					
Operating expenses, Public Buildings Service.....	154,590,000	170,500,000	160,850,000	169,300,000	165,075,000
Repair and improvement of public buildings.....	60,000,000	60,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000	58,000,000
Construction and acquisition of public buildings.....		185,000,000			
Construction, public buildings projects.....			144,836,000	171,980,000	165,441,000
Sites and expenses, public buildings projects.....	25,000,000		25,000,000	19,500,000	21,000,000
Payments, public buildings purchase contracts.....	1,675,000	4,630,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Construction of relocation facilities.....		3,800,000		3,800,000	
Operating expenses, Federal Supply Service.....	3,770,000	4,240,000	3,716,500	4,247,000	3,978,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....	(2,230,000)	(3,260,000)	(3,243,500)	(3,243,500)	(3,243,500)
Expenses, supply distribution.....	21,450,000	23,300,000	22,950,000	22,950,000	22,950,000
Operating expenses, National Archives and Records Service.....	9,176,800	9,600,000	9,420,000	9,420,000	9,420,000
Operating expenses, Transportation and Public Utilities Service.....	2,000,000	2,400,000	2,375,000	2,375,000	2,375,000
Strategic and critical materials.....		39,132,000	30,000,000	30,000,000	30,000,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of Administrator.....	225,000	240,000	240,000	240,000	240,000
Allowances and office facilities for former Presidents.....	200,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
Refunds under Renegotiation Act.....		900,000	900,000	900,000	900,000
Working Capital Fund.....		*100,000		100,000	
Administrative operations fund (limitation).....	(12,750,000)	(13,300,000)	(13,000,000)	(13,300,000)	(13,150,000)
Total, General Services Administration.....	278,086,800	504,092,000	462,537,500	497,055,000	483,629,000
HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY					
Office of the Administrator:					
Salaries and expenses.....	9,342,000	10,637,000	10,327,000	10,327,000	10,327,000
Urban planning grants.....	3,375,000	4,750,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000
Reserve of planned public works (payment to revolving fund).....	6,000,000	7,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
Grants for slum clearance and urban renewal.....	107,500,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000	150,000,000
Housing for the elderly (payment to revolving fund).....			5,000,000	50,000,000	20,000,000
Housing studies (liquidation of contract authorization).....		600,000			
Total, Office of the Administrator.....	126,217,000	172,987,000	175,327,000	220,327,000	190,327,000
Public Housing Administration:					
Annual contributions.....	120,000,000	146,000,000	140,000,000	140,000,000	140,000,000
Administrative expenses.....	12,830,000	13,200,000	13,050,000	13,050,000	13,050,000
Total, Public Housing Administration.....	132,830,000	159,200,000	153,050,000	153,050,000	153,050,000
Total, Housing and Home Finance Agency.....	259,047,000	332,187,000	328,377,000	373,377,000	343,377,000
INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	19,650,000	20,500,000	19,777,000	20,500,000	20,138,500
NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	91,400,000	*170,760,000	166,500,000	170,760,000	170,760,000
Research and development.....	330,875,000	*621,453,000	602,240,000	671,453,000	621,453,000
Construction and equipment.....	62,800,000	*122,787,000	107,275,000	122,787,000	122,787,000
Total, National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	485,075,000	915,000,000	876,015,000	965,000,000	915,000,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Independent offices appropriation bill, 1961—Continued

TITLE I—INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued

Item	Appropriations, 1960 ¹	Budget esti- mates, 1961	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
INDEPENDENT OFFICES—Continued					
NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY					
Operation and maintenance of properties.....	\$40,000	\$41,000	\$40,000	-----	\$40,000
NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	152,773,000	190,000,000	160,000,000	\$191,600,000	175,800,000
Salaries and expenses (special foreign currency program).....		1,600,000			
Total, National Science Foundation.....	152,773,000	191,600,000	160,000,000	191,600,000	175,800,000
RENEGOTIATION BOARD					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,850,000	2,870,000	2,870,000	2,870,000	2,870,000
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	8,100,000	* 9,300,000	8,525,000	9,300,000	8,912,500
SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM					
Salaries and expenses.....	29,278,400	32,950,000	30,278,400	32,778,400	31,528,400
VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION					
General operating expenses.....	165,373,000	* 153,500,000	153,500,000	153,500,000	153,500,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses.....	29,349,000	28,469,000	30,000,000	39,000,000	34,500,000
Inpatient care.....	800,889,000	817,021,000	817,021,000	817,021,000	817,021,000
Outpatient care.....	83,866,000	86,481,000	86,481,000	86,481,000	86,481,000
Maintenance and operation of supply depots.....	2,266,500	2,520,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000
Compensation and pensions.....	3,400,000,000	3,840,000,000	3,800,000,000	3,800,000,000	3,800,000,000
Readjustment benefits.....	585,000,000	* 344,000,000	344,000,000	344,000,000	344,000,000
Veterans insurance and indemnities.....	53,000,000	48,800,000	48,800,000	48,800,000	48,800,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....	(690,000)	(685,000)	(685,000)	(685,000)	(685,000)
Grants to the Republic of the Philippines.....	2,000,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities.....	31,659,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000	75,000,000
Total, Veterans' Administration.....	5,153,402,500	5,397,291,000	5,358,802,000	5,367,802,000	5,363,302,000
Total, definite appropriations.....	7,162,985,700	8,413,452,000	8,178,138,900	8,455,484,400	8,307,964,900
Total, indefinite appropriations.....	2,920,000	3,945,000	3,928,500	3,928,500	3,928,500
Total, title I.....	7,165,905,700	8,417,397,000	8,182,067,400	8,459,412,900	8,311,893,400

¹ Includes 1960 amounts contained in 1st supplemental, mutual security supplemental, 2d supplemental, and H.J. Res. 621.

² Estimate decreased \$21,000,000 in H. Doc. 371.

³ Includes \$3,200,000 contained in H. Doc. 329.

⁴ Includes \$76,300,000 contained in H. Doc. 329.

⁵ Includes \$33,500,000 contained in H. Doc. 329.

⁶ Estimate decreased \$554,000 in H. Doc. 328.

⁷ Estimate decreased \$66,000,000 in H. Doc. 328.

⁸ Contained in S. Doc. 106.

⁹ Includes \$400,000 contained in S. Doc. 106.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

[Limitations on Amounts of Corporate Funds To Be Expended]

Corporation or agency	Authorization, 1960	Budget esti- mates, 1961	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
Federal Home Loan Bank Board.....	(\$1,800,000)	(\$2,075,000)	(\$1,943,000)	(\$1,943,000)	(\$1,943,000)
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.....	(775,000)	(800,000)	(787,500)	(800,000)	(800,000)
General Services Administration:					
Abaca fiber program.....	(47,000)				
Federal Facilities Corporation.....	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)	(20,000)
Reconstruction Finance Corporation Liquidation Fund.....	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)	(40,000)
Housing and Home Finance Agency:					
College housing loans.....	(1,723,000)	(1,400,000)	(1,260,000)	(1,400,000)	(1,330,000)
Public facility loans.....	(525,000)	(530,000)	(477,000)	(530,000)	(503,500)
Revolving fund (liquidating programs).....	(653,000)	(155,000)	(139,500)	(139,500)	(139,500)
Federal National Mortgage Association.....	(6,150,000)	(6,650,000)	(6,550,000)	(6,550,000)	(6,550,000)
Federal Housing Administration.....	(8,100,000)	(8,800,000)	(8,450,000)	(8,650,000)	(8,530,000)
Public Housing Administration.....	(12,830,000)	(13,200,000)	(13,050,000)	(13,050,000)	(13,050,000)
Total, administrative expenses.....	(32,663,000)	(33,670,000)	(32,717,000)	(33,122,500)	(32,926,000)

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am very happy to see that the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, as reported by the Senate-House conferees, provides \$20 million to begin a low-cost direct loan program for the construction of housing for low-income elderly persons.

Although this figure is slightly less than a mathematical division between the \$5 million provided by the House and the \$50 million which the Senate passed in adopting my amendment on June 22, it is a significant achievement on behalf of the millions of low-income elderly families who, without a program such as this, would never be able to find decent housing at costs they could afford.

All the members on this side of the aisle who spoke so eloquently to the

enormous need for this type of program have reason to be glad that, at last, we will be able to make a real start in this important area of concern.

I am sure, too, that without the interest and full support of the Senate conferees, especially the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], it would have been impossible to achieve the appropriation now proposed. I personally am deeply indebted to the Senator from Washington and to his colleagues on the conference committee for their support and efforts in this cause.

As a result, there is now a prospect that, in the coming year, money will be available to private, nonprofit corporations to build approximately 2,000 housing units for the elderly at charges of

nearly \$20 a month less than they would be under conventional FHA financing. This is only 154 units less than all the units that have been completed and occupied in the 4 years since 1956 that FHA has provided mortgage insurance for elderly housing.

I only hope, Mr. President, that, having persistently opposed this badly needed program, the administration will sign the measure and begin promptly to implement the law of the land. I have no doubt that, if it wishes, it will be able to find reasons for administrative delay. But at least the money will be there for the next—and hopefully more friendly—administration to meet the pressing needs of those elderly citizens who made possible everything that we are able to enjoy today.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of June 30, 1960.)

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, the conference report provides \$994,855,000 for the military construction program. This is \$193,145,000 below the budget estimates; \$72,372,000 below the Senate bill, and \$118,710,000 above the House bill. The specific items added to the House bill are listed in the statement of the managers. The bill includes \$70 million for additional facilities for the Titan ballistic missile. This estimate was not considered by the House. The House conferees accepted the Senate increases for the Army Reserve and Army National Guard construction programs as well as those for the Air National Guard.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The figure in the conference report is \$118,710,000 above the House bill. Will the gentleman explain where that money is being expended and for what purposes?

Mr. SHEPPARD. There was a series of increases. If the gentleman will check the conference report he will find them listed in detail. If the gentleman insists on going through the entire list, I will be glad to.

Mr. GROSS. No, I do not insist on that, but the increase above the House figure is a substantial amount. I just wondered if the chairman could tell us briefly where this increase is going.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The major item is \$70 million for additional facilities in support of the Titan ballistic missile program.

This item was submitted to the Senate by the Department of Defense after House action on the bill.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield, I will be glad to give the gentleman from Iowa a copy of the conference report. The items about which he asks are listed there.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. I am led to believe from meager available information that the committee of conference, pursuant to the urging of the other body, included an item of \$182,000 for a military reserve center at Troy, Ohio. May I ask the gentleman from California if that item was in the bill when it passed the House?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That was not in the bill as it passed the House. It is, however, in the conference committee report.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 1, line 8, insert the following:

"MILITARY CONSTRUCTION"

"For construction as authorized by title IV of the Act of June 8, 1960 (Public Law 86-500), to remain available until expended, not to exceed \$20,000,000, to be derived by transfer from funds available to the Office of the Secretary of Defense for advanced research projects."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 5: Page 2, line 6, insert the following: *Provided*, That the words "solar furnace" under this head in the Military Construction Appropriation Act, 1959, are amended to read "solar facilities."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

(Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1961—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11776) making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk proceeded to read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House June 30, 1960.)

Mr. THOMAS (interrupting the reading of the statement). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GROSS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman if he will explain the bill.

Mr. THOMAS. I will do my best.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I will attempt briefly to explain the conference report. May I say I hope it meets with the approval of the House. I doubt if there are very many items that will give us too much concern.

The budget estimate was for 22 independent offices, and in round figures it was \$8,400 million. We cut the budget

about \$235 million. When it came to the other body, the other body added about \$275 million over and above the budget estimate. Then we went to conference, and there are 77 items in disagreement; 70 of them are in the conference report. We bring only seven items in technical disagreement. In fact, there are really no items in disagreement.

I will state to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross] that we have completed our conference, and we compromised and reduced the figure of the other body by about 55 percent.

If there are no further questions on the conference report—

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. I want to commend my chairman, the gentleman from Texas, on doing an excellent job, as he always does. I notice the position of the House has been receded in about 20 different instances. I am principally concerned at this time about the public buildings program. Funds for some five or six additional new buildings in the District of Columbia are being provided. It appears to many that the District is already saturated with Federal public buildings under construction. I wonder if we might be able to reduce some of the expenditures for public buildings in the District of Columbia.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to the distinguished gentleman who serves on this subcommittee and knows about as much about this bill as I do or anybody else—he is a hardworking Member—we had three of these buildings in our bill when it left the House. At that time they were subject to a point of order. They had to be approved, not by the House of Representatives or the other body but by the appropriate legislative committee of the House and the appropriate legislative committee of the Senate, and there was a little disagreement between the two committees. Now they have all agreed, and there are four of these buildings in here at a total cost of in the neighborhood of \$79 million.

There is no question about it; it is a lot of money. Your committee, as you will recall, reduced construction costs on these projects by 15 percent, and on one building it was reduced from \$23 million to \$15 million.

I join my friend in the thought that this building program in the District of Columbia has been sufficiently saturated to last a few years.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. EVINS. I notice the conference report states that the funds for this building program have been increased from \$144 million to \$165 million, and in addition there is a provision which allows an overrun of 10 percent instead of 5 percent as recommended by the House. Will this provision permit contractors to expend 10 percent more money than the estimated cost?

Mr. THOMAS. No, it is not an overrun. You recall we put in 5 percent within the sum of money appropriated. We gave our distinguished friend Mr. FLOETE, whom we all admire and who is one of the finest administrators in the entire Government service. We allowed him certain latitude. If he can reduce a project below the figure we have allowed, and should need a little more for another project up to 10 percent, that is all right. But he always has to remain within the sum appropriated.

Mr. EVINS. I commend my friend and am glad to have his explanation.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. I would like to say to the chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee that there is one item with which I am concerned and with which I think the membership of the House ought to be concerned, and that is the creation of a new division within the Federal Communications Commission established primarily for the purpose of monitoring TV performances. When the FCC appeared before the Independent Offices Subcommittee there was no testimony with reference to this item. There was no request by the FCC for additional employees to monitor the entire TV area. When the FCC Chairman and his staff came before the Senate Committee on Independent Offices they requested the creation of 25 additional jobs and the appropriation of an additional \$300,000 for the purpose of monitoring TV programs.

I think the setting up of a monitoring unit is a dangerous precedent to establish. I do not think that any governmental bureaucratic monitoring unit is going to improve television in any respect. It will not improve the scripts, and it will not make better shows. In my judgment I think the public itself is best able to judge precisely what it wants, I do not think the Federal Government ought to go into the field of telling people precisely what they ought to have.

Frankly, I think it is inspired by the fact that the FCC is concerned over the criticism it has received in the past couple of years and now they are tumbling over each other before the country and the Congress to show they are now doing something.

I think it is bad practice. I hope that the FCC will be careful to guard against any form of censorship. When this new section is set up.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on the omnibus rivers and harbors authorization bill. I am very grateful to the House conferees for accepting the Senate committee's inclusion of flood control proposals for the Chicopee River Basin and the Westfield River watershed. These projects will be of vital importance to my congressional district, which has suffered terrific losses in the past from the floods on the Connecticut, Chicopee, and Westfield Rivers.

Earlier this year I had introduced a bill, H.R. 11470, to provide for flood

control measures in the Chicopee River Basin, based upon the recommendations of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. The omnibus authorization bill had already passed the House, last year as a matter of fact, and was pending in the Senate Public Works Committee when the Army Engineers made the recommendations. I testified in behalf of my bill when the Senate committee held its public hearings, and asked that these projects be included. The Senators were kind enough to accede to my request.

Mr. Speaker, my bill calls for the construction of a dam and reservoir on Conant Brook, 2 miles southeast of Monson, Mass., at an estimated cost of \$2,060,000; construction of local protective works on the Chicopee River at Chicopee Falls, Mass., at an estimated cost of \$1,860,000; and construction of local protective works on the Chicopee, Ware, and Quabog Rivers in Palmer, Mass., at an estimated cost of \$1,260,000. Again, I want to thank members of the House-Senate conference for including these projects in the omnibus authorization bill.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, our very able and genial colleague from Massachusetts always makes a good statement and certainly he has just made one. We discussed this matter before we went to conference. I may say that I was almost of the same opinion that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] was. We talked with gentlemen in the other body and they assured us—if you will get their report and read it you will understand—and they came out and said flatly not one penny of this money will be spent for censorship. There is not a cent in here for censorship. I see the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], of much fame, sitting here. I understand he is interested in this matter. His committee also urged that we adopt or go along to some degree with the Senate in this matter.

I agree with the gentleman from Massachusetts to a large extent that it should not be permanent because if it is permanently necessary our beloved chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] ought to write some more legislation. This is not a new precedent by any means. The Federal Trade Commission has been monitoring a few programs around the clock for 18 months or 2 years. This is simply eyes and ears to see what is going on, to see if this law that these gentlemen are trying to pass is correct. I will join the gentleman that we will not let them go wild.

Mr. BOLAND. There is nothing more permanent than temporary employees in the Government service.

Mr. THOMAS. And the gentleman is helping all the time to reduce agencies.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I would like to know what is going on.

The SPEAKER. I think the gentlemen who are explaining the bill should take the well of the House.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the other body would have done with this particular request if a request by some agency to establish a similar compliance division for newspapers had been suggested?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, as the gentleman knows, they have no jurisdiction over newspapers.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I want to comment on the same item in the report as did the gentleman from Massachusetts. I cannot agree that the precedent of monitoring commercials by the Federal Trade Commission is any justification for commencing a new precedent of monitoring TV programs content. The FTC is not concerned with programs, they are concerned with commercials only. You can say the monitoring is not censorship, but I do not think anybody can argue persuasively there is a distinct difference between monitoring and censorship. Monitoring is only the first step.

Mr. THOMAS. Let us go on with this conference report. We cannot seriously disagree with the gentleman's point of view, and we are not. I will give you my word, and to the gentleman from Massachusetts as well, we are not going to let them run hog-wild on this program. It looks to me like it should be reduced a little bit in 1 or 2 years. Your point of view and ours is not too far apart.

Mr. AVERY. There is no hearing record on the part of the House that would substantiate this request; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS. I listened to the very able debate by the gentleman's distinguished committee. There was plenty of argument on both sides. I thought maybe we were holding the hand of your distinguished committee and backing you up a little.

Mr. AVERY. The gentleman does not want to leave the inference that our distinguished chairman had suggested this item should be agreed to on the part of the House conferees?

Mr. THOMAS. I see your distinguished chairman in the front row, and I will let him speak for himself.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. EVINS. One of the purposes of this appropriation is to provide a check on performance of programs which they promised. Legislation permits of a certain type of program, and the employees of FCC will check to see that the law is complied with. I see nothing wrong with that, in view of the fact that there has been so much evidence of payola, rigging of quiz programs, and other unwholesome practices in broadcasting that have been going on, and I personally support the appropriation for the checking and correction of these practices. I hope that the conference report will be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman for his great contribution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. May I ask the gentleman if those two buildings that were taken out of the appropriation bill on the point of order—

Mr. THOMAS. By the Gross point of order; yes, sir.

Mr. GROSS. Well, that is a pretty good point of order, I will say.

Mr. THOMAS. No argument on that point.

Mr. GROSS. Are they provided for in this bill; the buildings?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes, they are.

Mr. GROSS. Well, let me ask the gentleman if the amendment on page 16 of the bill still prevails.

Mr. THOMAS. They are provided for in this bill; the four of them.

Mr. GROSS. Well, are they in there under this language: "subject to the provision of any such approval adopted by the Committee on Public Works."

Mr. THOMAS. That approval has been granted, and we will give you the dates of the two bodies, the other body and our own body. The language is in the bill, and it was put in by the other body, and, as a matter of ultra precaution, we did not strike it out.

Mr. GROSS. So the authorizing language has gone through?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. On this monitoring provision, has the gentleman consulted the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss]? I am asking in good faith.

Mr. THOMAS. No, we have not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. For more than 4 years he has been chairman of the subcommittee asking the departments for information. Just a couple of weeks ago, we put through a bill which enabled the Commissioner to monitor information which we should have as to a certain project. What is going to be the effect now if you get this in? Are the findings of the Moss committee, which are valuable, to be disregarded?

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to our beloved friend, it was my understanding that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], was more or less concerned with the agencies' withholding information in the form of printed releases.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that true with the newspapers? They were the ones that were pushing that issue. Here, if I get it right, you want the right, or this Commission, to have the authority of monitoring; is that right? Does that mean suppressing?

Mr. THOMAS. Of course it does not.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What does it mean?

Mr. THOMAS. It means you are giving them a little money to listen to the programs, and when they listen to them, that is all the authority they have, to be honest about it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. If that is all there is to the legislation why pay anyone to listen?

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield, since my name has been brought into this?

Mr. THOMAS. I will be delighted to.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I can appreciate the concern of some people about providing additional employees, but the Federal Communications Act itself specifically prohibits censorship. You might call this compliance or monitoring or whatever you want to, but the fact remains that the Federal Trade Commission would tell us that in matters of this kind they have no jurisdiction; it is the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission. The Federal Communications Commission would say "We do not have any agency personnel set up for this kind of program." Now, are we going to proceed with this kind of a procedure where no one has anything to say whether or not these matters of deceptive practices, and so forth, are to be looked into? That is all this does, and I think it should be approved.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALTER. Is it not a fact that the very thing that is being questioned here today has been done ever since the act was put on the statute books?

Mr. THOMAS. Why, of course. The act specifically says there will be no censorship.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, as one of the conferees I should like to say that I believe we brought back a good and reasonable report. It is a sound compromise with the Senate on this important appropriation bill which covers funds of many independent agencies. I think it is important for us to bear in mind that this bill in its entirety as it was submitted by the Budget amounted to \$8,417 million. The Senate increased it over the Budget, but in resolving the differences of all these independent agencies, this conference report comes back to you \$151 million less than the Senate appropriation bill as passed by the other body. It is \$125 million over the bill as passed by the House. In this difference or increase over the original bill, you will find the restoration of funds for certain public buildings which have since been authorized. I think we have arrived at a sound and sane solution of all these items. I am pleased with the agreements reached with the conferees of the other body, and recommend the adoption of this conference report.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, can he tell me what is the total overall increase over the House bill in the appropriation for NASA?

Mr. THOMAS. Thirty-nine million dollars.

Mr. OSTERTAG. The amount as it comes back to us in this conference re-

port is exactly the same as submitted by the budget. That is approximately \$39 million over the House Bill as we passed it.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Some amount was restored for salaries, is not that correct?

Mr. OSTERTAG. It was restored to the Budget level. This is an increase of over \$4 million for this purpose, and I might add that funds have been restored for research and construction to the Budget level. This totals about \$39 million.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. YATES. As a matter of fact, I had a conference with the head of the Space Agency yesterday and he said that he thought the amount was satisfactory for his purposes.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HERLONG].

(Mr. HERLONG asked and was given permission to speak out of order and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in this graduation season the press last Wednesday night reported a disgraceful incident which reflects, not on the great organization concerned, but on the training which some of our youth is receiving.

I refer to the action of a high school honor graduate about 2 weeks ago in refusing to accept the American Legion's good citizenship award because, he said, he could not respect its policies; and to the account of the exhibition of boorish conduct which on Wednesday greeted a similar award to a young man who is said to have an appointment to the United States Naval Academy.

What are these policies of the American Legion which some of our brightest youth proclaim that they cannot respect?

To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America.

To maintain law and order.

To foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Americanism.

To inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State, and Nation.

To combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses.

To make right the master of might.

To promote peace and good will on earth.

To safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom, and democracy.

I state as a general principle that any American should subscribe wholeheartedly and enthusiastically to those policies which I have just quoted. God help our country if the preservation of our way of life is ever entrusted to and depends on those who proclaim their disrespect for our country and for its Constitution.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I want to join with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS] in objecting to the program of spending millions upon millions of dollars for more

buildings in the District of Columbia. I regret very much that the committee saw fit to put millions for that purpose in this bill after it was stricken when the bill was originally before the House.

Mr. THOMAS. We will try to hold it down in the future.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 1: Page 2, line 12, insert the following: "not to exceed \$6,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and not to exceed \$900,000 for expenses of travel;".

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named therein insert \$2,500.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: Page 6, line 22, insert the following: "and the Act of August 28, 1938 (49 Stat. 956), as amended by the Act of August 27, 1951 (65 Stat. 198), is hereby repealed."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 13, line 23, insert the following; "Provided, That the Commission is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but without regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, to place six General Schedule positions in the following grades: four in Grade GS-18, one in grade GS-17, and one in grade GS-16; and such positions shall be in addition to positions previously allocated to this agency under section 505 of said Act."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: Page 16, line 18, insert the following: "subject to approval of any such project by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44: Page 19, line 9, insert the following:

"CONSTRUCTION, FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING NUMBERED 7, WASHINGTON, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The appropriation contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the head 'Construction, United States Court of Claims and Federal Office Building, Washington, District of Columbia' is hereby made available for expenses necessary for the preparation of plans and specifications for a building in Washington, District of Columbia, for use of agencies of the executive branch of the Government without provision of space for the United States Court of Claims."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 22, line 14, insert the following: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(a)), may be transferred to stockpiles established in accordance with said Act: *Provided further*,."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. THOMAS moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: After the word "transferred" insert "without reimbursement".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 52: Page 26, line 9, insert the following: "In disposing of surplus real estate and buildings a reasonable period of time shall be allowed for local governmental units to perfect a comprehensive and coordinated plan of use and procurement."

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

RIVER AND HARBOR AND FLOOD CONTROL ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 7634), authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALTER). Is there objection to the re-

quest of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. DAVIS].

There was no objection.

(For conference report and statement see proceedings of the House June 30, 1960.)

The Clerk proceeded to read the statement.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, because the conference report and statement has been made a part of the RECORD, and further because the report and statement is in document form, I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the conference on the part of the House and Senate was a thorough and exhaustive one on this public works authorization bill.

The House will recall that on July 16, 1959, this House unanimously passed its bill. Some projects were added in the other body.

We come back today with a bill confident that it has met all of the objections of the interested agencies and the Budget Bureau, and we are equally confident that it will receive careful and favorable attention by the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Is it correct that the conference report, as reported by the conferees, eliminated projects that were disagreed to by the Executive?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. And it brought them into conformity with Executive recommendations with these amendments; and, in effect, the House bill as it passed the House in July was in conformity and this report brings the Senate bill substantially into conformity?

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. The House bill included only \$658 million. The Senate increased it to \$1,580 million. In other words, the Senate added about \$924 million. Of course this caused us considerable concern. The reasons for that increase are threefold. First, there were \$359 million worth of projects added. I ask the gentleman if that is not correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Resulting from increases in modifications of flood control basic authorizations necessitated between the time when the House passed the bill nearly a year ago and when the Senate passed the bill recently.

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. That is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. And, second, about \$300 million was added in rivers and harbors, which were processed and cleared in the passage of time between when the

Public Law 86-626
86th Congress, H. R. 11776
July 12, 1960

AN ACT

74 STAT. 425.

Making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1961.
sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, namely:

TITLE I

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a) ; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; expenses of attendance of cooperating officials and individuals at meetings concerned with civil defense functions; not to exceed \$2,500 for emergency and extraordinary expenses to be expended under the direction of the Director for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; and not to exceed \$900,000 for expenses of travel; \$24,700,000: *Provided*, That contracts for not to exceed two persons under this appropriation for temporary or intermittent services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), may be renewed annually, and one such contract, for the services of an expert or consultant for telecommunications, may provide for a per diem rate of not to exceed \$75. 60 Stat. 810.

CIVIL DEFENSE AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION FUNCTIONS OF FEDERAL AGENCIES

For expenses necessary to enable other Federal agencies to perform such civil defense and defense mobilization functions as may be designated by the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization, including payments by the Department of Labor to State employment security agencies for the full cost of administration of defense manpower mobilization activities, \$6,250,000.

FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For financial contributions to the States for civil defense purposes pursuant to the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to be equally matched with State funds, \$16,000,000, of which not to exceed \$6,000,000 shall become available on January 1, 1961, for allocation to the States pursuant to section 205 of said Act. 64 Stat. 1246.
50 USC app. 2251 note.
72 Stat. 533.
50 USC app. 2286.

EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

64 Stat. 1249.
50 USC app.2281.

For expenses necessary for procurement, warehousing, distribution, and maintenance of emergency civil defense materials as authorized by subsection (h) of section 201 of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, \$9,175,000.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

50 USC app.2281.

60 Stat. 810.

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for studies and research to develop measures and plans for evacuation, shelter, and the protection of life and property, as authorized by section 201(d) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$2,500,000 shall be available to complete the two-year program of fallout shelter prototype construction.

No part of any appropriation in this Act shall be available for the construction of warehouses or for the lease of warehouse space in any building which is to be constructed specifically for the use of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

60 Stat. 810.

For necessary expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Board, including contract stenographic reporting services; employment of temporary guards on a contract or fee basis; hire, operation, maintenance, and repair of aircraft; purchase (one for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates for individuals not to exceed \$50 per diem; \$7,392,500.

PAYMENTS TO AIR CARRIERS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

72 Stat. 763.

For payments to air carriers of so much of the compensation fixed and determined by the Civil Aeronautics Board under section 406 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 1376), as is payable by the Board, \$65,000,000, to remain available until expended.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

60 Stat. 810.

5 USC 1181, 118k-118n.

41 USC 5.

For necessary expenses, including not to exceed \$22,000 for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); not to exceed \$10,000 for medical examinations performed for veterans by private physicians on a fee basis; payment in advance for library membership in societies whose publications are available to members only or to members at a price lower than to the general public; not to exceed \$77,000 for performing the duties imposed upon the Commission by the Act of July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 767); reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services for protection of confidential files; and not to exceed \$5,000 for actuarial services by contract, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, as amended; \$19,405,000: *Provided*, That no part

of this appropriation shall be available for the Career Executive Board established by Executive Order 10758 of March 4, 1958, as amended. 5 USC 631

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Legal Examining Unit in the Examining and Personnel Utilization Division of the Commission, established pursuant to Executive Order 9358 of July 1, 1943. 3 CFR, 1943-1948 Comp., p. 256.

No part of the appropriations herein made to the Civil Service Commission shall be available for printing the Official Register of the United States, and the Act of August 28, 1938 (49 Stat. 956), as amended by the Act of August 27, 1951 (65 Stat. 198), is hereby repealed. 5 USC 654.

INVESTIGATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS FOR EMPLOYMENT BY INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 10422 of January 9, 1953, as amended, prescribing procedures for making available to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and the executive heads of other international organizations, certain information concerning United States citizens employed, or being considered for employment by such organizations, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$400,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for advances or reimbursements to the applicable appropriations or funds of the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for expenses incurred by such agencies under said Executive order: *Provided further*, That members of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board may be paid actual transportation expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence authorized by the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, while traveling on official business away from their homes or regular places of business, including periods while en route to and from and at the place where their services are to be performed: *Provided further*, That nothing in sections 281 or 283 of title 18, United States Code, or in section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99) shall be deemed to apply to any person because of appointment for part-time or intermittent service as a member of the International Organizations Employees Loyalty Board in the Civil Service Commission as established by Executive Order 10422, dated January 9, 1953, as amended. 22 USC 287 note. 60 Stat. 810. 63 Stat. 166. 5 USC 835 note. 62 Stat. 697.

ANNUITIES UNDER SPECIAL ACTS

For payment of annuities authorized by the Act of May 29, 1944, as amended (48 U.S.C. 1373a), and the Act of August 19, 1950, as amended (33 U.S.C. 771-775), \$2,316,000. 58 Stat. 258. 64 Stat. 465.

GOVERNMENT PAYMENT FOR ANNUITANTS, EMPLOYEES HEALTH BENEFITS FUND

For payment to the "Employees health benefits fund" of Government contributions with respect to annuitants, as authorized by section 7 of the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act (73 Stat. 713), \$2,500,000, to remain available until expended. 5 USC 3006.

PAYMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

For financing the annuity benefits and increases, during the current fiscal year, provided by the Act of June 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 218), \$46,329,000, to be credited to the civil service retirement and disability fund. 5 USC 2259 note.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, EMPLOYEES LIFE INSURANCE FUND

Not to exceed \$250,000 of the funds in the "Employees' Life Insurance Fund" shall be available for reimbursement to the Civil Service Commission for administrative expenses incurred by the Commission during the current fiscal year in the administration of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2091-2103): *Provided*, That this limitation shall include expenses incurred under section 10 of the Act, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1 of Public Law 85-377 (5 U.S.C. 2094(c)).

68 Stat. 736.

72 Stat. 87.

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Federal Aviation Agency, not otherwise provided for, including administrative expenses for research and development and for establishment of air navigation facilities, and carrying out the provisions of the Federal Airport Act; purchase twenty passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; not to exceed \$5,000 for representation allowances and for official entertainment; and purchase and repair of skis and snowshoes; \$373,064,000: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation, funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and operation of air navigation facilities.

60 Stat. 170.
49 USC 1101
note.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR NAVIGATION FACILITIES

For an additional amount for the acquisition, establishment, and improvement by contract or purchase and hire of air navigation facilities, including the initial acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant; the construction and furnishing of quarters and related accommodations for officers and employees of the Federal Aviation Agency stationed at remote localities where such accommodations are not available (at a total cost of construction of not to exceed \$50,000 per housing unit in Alaska); purchase of six aircraft; and the initial flight checking of air navigation facilities and the transportation by air to and from and within Alaska and the Territories of the United States of materials and equipment secured under this appropriation: \$163,250,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources, for expenses incurred in the establishment of air navigation facilities.

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR AIRPORTS (LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)

For liquidation of obligations incurred under authority granted in the Act of August 3, 1955 (69 Stat. 441), to enter into contracts, \$80,000,000, to remain available until expended.

49 USC 1101-
1105, 1108, 1111,
1104 note.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary for research, development, and service testing, including construction of experimental facilities and acquisition of necessary sites by lease or grant, \$64,000,000, to remain available until expended.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Washington National Airport, including purchase of one passenger motor vehicle, for replacement only, for police-type use which may exceed by \$300 the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; \$3,230,000.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE, DULLES INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

For expenses incident to the care, operation, maintenance, improvement and protection of the Dulles International Airport, including purchase of four passenger motor vehicles, of which three for police-type use may exceed by \$300 each the general purchase price limitation for the current fiscal year; purchase, cleaning, and repair of uniforms; and arms and ammunition; \$2,450,000.

CONSTRUCTION, WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

For necessary expenses for construction at Washington National Airport, including acquisition of land, \$4,500,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISION

During the current fiscal year applicable appropriations to the Federal Aviation Agency shall be available for the Federal Aviation Agency to conduct the activities specified in the Act of October 26, 1949, as amended (5 U.S.C. 596a), under determinations and regulations by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency; maintenance and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; and uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131). 63 Stat. 907. 68 Stat. 1114.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in performing the duties of the Commission as authorized by law, including land and structures (not to exceed \$23,000), special counsel fees, improvement and care of grounds and repairs to buildings (not to exceed \$14,600), services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), not to exceed \$165,000 for expenses of travel, and purchase of not to exceed three passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, \$13,085,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$2,000,000 of this appropriation shall be available for a special ultra-high frequency television study and shall remain available until June 30, 1962. 60 Stat. 810.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the work of the Commission, as authorized by law, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, \$7,663,500, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be available for special counsel and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not exceeding \$50 per diem for individuals: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized, subject to the procedures prescribed in the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, but without regard to the numerical limitations contained therein, 60 Stat. 810. 63 Stat. 954. 5 USC 1071 note.

5 USC 1105.

to place six General Schedule positions in the following grades: four in grade GS-18, one in grade GS-17, and one in grade GS-16; and such positions shall be in addition to positions previously allocated to this agency under section 505 of said Act.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

68 Stat. 1114.
60 Stat. 810.

For necessary expenses of the Federal Trade Commission, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$7,507,500: *Provided*, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be expended upon any investigation hereafter provided by concurrent resolution of the Congress until funds are appropriated subsequently to the enactment of such resolution to finance the cost of such investigation.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

60 Stat. 810.

For necessary expenses of the General Accounting Office, including rental or lease of office space in foreign countries without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$41,150,000.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

OPERATING EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS SERVICE

69 Stat. 722.
47 Stat. 412,
1517.

For necessary expenses of real property management and related activities as provided by law; rental of buildings in the District of Columbia; restoration of leased premises; moving Government agencies (including space adjustments) in connection with the assignment, allocation, and transfer of building space; acquisition by purchase or otherwise and disposal by sale or otherwise of real estate and interests therein; and payments in lieu of taxes pursuant to the Act of August 12, 1955 (40 U.S.C. 521); \$165,075,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available, without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932, as amended (40 U.S.C. 278a), with respect to buildings, or parts thereof, heretofore leased under the appropriation for "Emergency operating expenses".

REPAIR AND IMPROVEMENT OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

40 USC 601 note.

68 Stat. 518.

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to alter public buildings and to acquire additions to sites pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), including grounds, approaches and appurtenances, wharves and piers, together with the necessary dredging adjacent thereto; and care and safeguarding of sites acquired for public buildings; preliminary planning of projects by contract or otherwise; maintenance, preservation, demolition, and equipment; \$58,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That for the purposes of this appropriation, buildings constructed pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356) shall be considered to be public buildings.

CONSTRUCTION, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to construct public buildings projects and alter public buildings by extension or conversion where the estimated cost for a project is in excess of \$200,000 pursuant to the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479), including equipment for such buildings, \$165,441,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the foregoing amount shall be available for public buildings projects, subject to approval of any such project by resolutions adopted by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, at locations and at maximum construction improvement costs (excluding funds for sites and expenses) as follows:

Post office and Federal office building, Camden, Arkansas, \$633,250;
 Courthouse and Federal office building, San Francisco, California, \$37,286,100;

Courthouse and Federal office building, Hartford, Connecticut, \$7,636,400;

Federal office building, Miami, Florida, \$7,076,250;

Post office and courthouse, Thomasville, Georgia, \$1,094,000;

Border station, Jackman, Maine, \$289,850;

Border station, Van Buren, Maine, \$284,750;

Border station, Vanceboro, Maine, \$254,150;

Immigration and Naturalization Service center, (construction and alteration) Detroit, Michigan, \$874,650;

Border station, Sweetgrass, Montana, \$586,500;

General Services Administration stores depot annex, Albuquerque, New Mexico, \$469,200;

Post office and courthouse, Bismarck, North Dakota, \$3,224,050;

Federal office building, Toledo, Ohio, \$3,867,700;

Post office and courthouse (construction and alteration), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, \$5,601,500;

Courthouse and Federal office building, Memphis, Tennessee, \$9,587,150;

Border station, El Paso, Texas, \$1,055,700;

Post office and Federal office building, Dayton, Washington, \$282,200;

Federal Office Building Numbered Eight, District of Columbia, exclusive of laboratory and other equipment, \$15,105,000;

Federal Office Building Numbered Nine, District of Columbia, \$20,031,100;

Federal Office Building Numbered Ten, District of Columbia, \$38,326,500; and

United States Court of Claims and Court of Customs and Patent Appeals building, \$6,375,000: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limits of costs may be exceeded to the extent that savings are effected in other projects, but by not to exceed 10 per centum: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$5,500,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used for clearing the site and installing footings for the authorized public building project at Chicago, Illinois.

SITES AND EXPENSES, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS

For an additional amount for expenses necessary in connection with the construction of public buildings projects not otherwise provided for, as specified under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Acts of 1959 and 1960, including preliminary planning of public buildings projects by contract or otherwise, \$21,000,000, to remain available until expended.

40 USC 601 note.

72 Stat. 1066;
73 Stat. 505.

CONSTRUCTION, FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDING NUMBERED 7, WASHINGTON,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

72 Stat. 1067. The appropriation contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the head "Construction, United States Court of Claims and Federal Office Building, Washington, District of Columbia" is hereby made available for expenses necessary for the preparation of plans and specifications for a building in Washington, District of Columbia, for use of agencies of the executive branch of the Government without provision of space for the United States Court of Claims.

PAYMENTS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS PURCHASE CONTRACTS

68 Stat. 518. For payments of principal, interest, taxes, and any other obligations under contracts entered into pursuant to the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 356), \$4,000,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES, FEDERAL SUPPLY SERVICE

63 Stat. 388.
40 USC 485. For necessary expenses of personal property management and related activities as authorized by law and not otherwise provided for, \$3,978,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$3,243,500 of any funds received during the current or preceding fiscal year for deposit under section 204(a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, and not otherwise disposed of by law, shall be deposited to the credit of this appropriation and shall be available for necessary expenses in carrying out the functions of the General Services Administration under the said Act, with respect to the utilization and disposal of excess and surplus personal property.

EXPENSES, SUPPLY DISTRIBUTION

For expenses, not otherwise provided, necessary for operation of the stores depot system and other procurement services, including contractual services incident to receiving, handling, and shipping warehouse items, \$22,950,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES, NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS SERVICE

For necessary expenses in connection with Federal records management and related activities as provided by law, including reimbursement for security guard services, and contractual services incident to movement or disposal of records, \$9,420,000.

OPERATING EXPENSES, TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC
UTILITIES SERVICE

60 Stat. 810. For necessary expenses of transportation and public utilities management and related activities, as provided by law, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem for individuals, \$2,375,000.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

60 Stat. 596. For necessary expenses in carrying out the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98-98b), during the current fiscal year, for transportation and handling, within the United States (including charges at United States ports), storage, security, and maintenance of strategic and critical materials acquired

for or transferred to the supplemental stockpile established pursuant to section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)), for carrying out the provisions of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451-462), relating to machine tools and industrial manufacturing equipment for which the General Services Administration is responsible, including reimbursement for security guard services, services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), and not to exceed \$2,948,000 for operating expenses, \$30,000,000, with which shall be merged the unobligated balances of funds remaining available under this head on June 30, 1960: *Provided*, That no part of funds available shall be used for construction of warehouses or tank storage facilities: *Provided further*, That during the current fiscal year, there shall be no limitation on the value of surplus strategic and critical materials which, in accordance with section 6(a) of the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98e(a)), may be transferred without reimbursement to stockpiles established in accordance with said Act: *Provided further*, That any receipts from sales during the current fiscal year shall be promptly deposited into the Treasury.

68 Stat. 456.

62 Stat. 1225.

60 Stat. 810.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR

For expenses of executive direction for activities under the control of the General Services Administration, \$240,000.

ALLOWANCES AND OFFICE FACILITIES FOR FORMER PRESIDENTS

For carrying out the provisions of the Act of August 25, 1958 (72 Stat. 838), \$250,000: *Provided*, That the Administrator of General Services shall transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of sections (a) and (e) of such Act.

3 USC 102

note; 39 USC

325a.

REFUNDS UNDER RENEGOTIATION ACT

For refunds under section 201(f) of the Renegotiation Act of 1951 (50 U.S.C. App. 1231(f)), \$900,000, to remain available until expended.

65 Stat. 23.

ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS FUND

Funds available to General Services Administration for administrative operations, in support of program activities, shall be expended and accounted for, as a whole, through a single fund, which is hereby authorized: *Provided*, That costs and obligations for such administrative operations for the respective program activities shall be accounted for in accordance with systems approved by the General Accounting Office: *Provided further*, That the total amount deposited into said account for the fiscal year 1961 from funds made available to General Services Administration in this Act shall not exceed \$13,150,000: *Provided further*, That amounts deposited into said account for administrative operations for each program shall not exceed the amounts included in the respective program appropriations for such purposes.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

The appropriate appropriation or fund available to the General Services Administration shall be credited with (1) cost of operation, protection, maintenance, upkeep, repair, and improvement, included as part of rentals received from Government corporations pursuant to law (40 U.S.C. 129); (2) reimbursements for services performed in

61 Stat. 584.

62 Stat. 1225.
50 USC 451 note.

respect to bonds and other obligations under the jurisdiction of the General Services Administration, issued by public authorities, States, or other public bodies, and such services in respect to such bonds or obligations as the Administrator deems necessary and in the public interest may, upon the request and at the expense of the issuing agencies, be provided from the appropriate foregoing appropriation; and (3) appropriations or funds available to other agencies, and transferred to the General Services Administration, in connection with property transferred to the General Services Administration pursuant to the Act of July 2, 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451ff), and such appropriations or funds may be so transferred, with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

Appropriations under the head "Construction, Public Buildings Projects" shall be available for acquisition of buildings and sites thereof by purchase, condemnation or otherwise, including prepayment of purchase contracts, or for other approved projects outside the District of Columbia.

Funds available to the General Services Administration shall be available for the hire of passenger motor vehicles.

Typewriting
machines.

No part of any money appropriated by this or any other Act for any agency of the executive branch of the Government shall be used during the current fiscal year for the purchase within the continental limits of the United States of any typewriting machines except in accordance with regulations issued pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended.

63 Stat. 377.
40 USC 471 note.

Not to exceed 2 per centum of any appropriation made available to the General Services Administration for the current fiscal year by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but no such appropriation shall be increased thereby more than 2 per centum: *Provided*, That such transfers shall apply only to operating expenses, and shall not exceed in the aggregate the amount of \$2,000,000.

40 USC 601
note.

Appropriations available to any department or agency during the current fiscal year for necessary expenses, including maintenance or operating expenses, shall also be available for reimbursement to the General Services Administration for those expenses of renovation and alteration of buildings and facilities which constitute public improvements, performed in accordance with the Public Buildings Act of 1959 (73 Stat. 479) or other applicable law.

In disposing of surplus real estate and buildings a reasonable period of time shall be allowed for local governmental units to perfect a comprehensive and coordinated plan of use and procurement.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

60 Stat. 810.

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Administrator, including rent in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); and purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; \$10,327,000: *Provided*, That necessary expenses of inspections and of providing representatives at the site of projects being planned or undertaken by local public agencies pursuant to title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, projects financed through loans to educational institutions authorized by title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, and projects and facilities financed by loans to public agencies pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be

42 USC 1450-
1462.
12 USC 1749-
1749c.
42 USC 1491-
1496.

compensated by such agencies or institutions by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenses for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative; and for the purpose of providing such inspections, the Administrator may utilize any agency and such agency may accept reimbursement or payment for such services from such institutions, or the Administrator, and shall credit such amounts to the appropriations or funds against which such charges have been made, but such nonadministrative expenses shall not exceed \$2,900,000.

URBAN PLANNING GRANTS

For grants in accordance with the provisions of section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, \$4,000,000.

73 Stat. 678.
40 USC 461.

RESERVE OF PLANNED PUBLIC WORKS (PAYMENT TO REVOLVING FUND)

For payment to the revolving fund established pursuant to section 702 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended (40 U.S.C. 462), \$3,000,000.

69 Stat. 641.

GRANTS FOR SLUM CLEARANCE AND URBAN RENEWAL

For an additional amount for payment of grants as authorized by title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1453, 1456), \$150,000,000.

HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY (PAYMENT TO REVOLVING FUND)

For payment to the revolving fund established pursuant to section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959, \$20,000,000.

73 Stat. 667.
12 USC 1701q.

PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

For the payment of annual contributions to public housing agencies in accordance with section 10 of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1410), \$140,000,000.

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration, \$13,050,000, to be expended under the authorization for such expenses contained in title II of this Act.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Interstate Commerce Commission, including not to exceed \$5,000 for the employment of special counsel; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals; and purchase of not to exceed thirty-three passenger motor vehicles of which twenty-seven shall be for replacement only; \$20,138,500, of which not less than \$1,567,000 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out railroad safety activities and not less than \$1,094,500 shall be available for expenses necessary to carry out locomotive inspection activities: *Provided*, That Joint Board members and cooperating State commissioners may use Government transportation requests when traveling in connection with their duties as such.

60 Stat. 810.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, including hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed \$5,375,000 for expenses of travel; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); \$170,760,000.

68 Stat. 1114.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

For contractual research, development, operations, technical services, repairs, alterations, and minor construction, and for supplies, materials, and equipment necessary for the conduct and support of aeronautical and space research and development activities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and purchase of sixty passenger motor vehicles, of which twenty-nine shall be for replacement only; \$621,453,000, to remain available until expended. *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for payment of salaries of National Aeronautics and Space Administration personnel.

CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT

For construction and equipment for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and for the acquisition or condemnation of real property as authorized by law, \$122,787,000, to remain available until expended.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation made available to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration by this Act may be transferred to any other such appropriation, but the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation shall not be thereby increased.

Not to exceed \$10,000 of appropriations in this Act for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration shall be available for scientific consultations and any emergency or extraordinary expense pursuant to section 1(h) of the legislative authorization for appropriations for the fiscal year 1961.

Ante, p. 152.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF PROPERTIES

For the operation and maintenance of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Act, \$40,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That so long as funds are available from appropriations for the foregoing purposes, the provisions of section 507 of the Housing Act of 1950 (Public Law 475, Eighty-first Congress), shall not be effective.

48 Stat. 930.
D. C. Code 5-111.
64 Stat. 81.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1861-1875), including award of graduate fellowships; services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals; hire of passenger motor vehicles; and reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard services; \$175,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the foregoing amount not less than \$30,250,000 shall be available for tuition, grants, and allowances in connection with a program of supplementary training for secondary school science and mathematics teachers: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$1,600,000 of the foregoing appropriation may be used to purchase foreign currencies which accrue under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), for the purposes authorized by section 104(k) of that Act.

64 Stat. 149.

60 Stat. 810.

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Renegotiation Board, including hire of passenger motor vehicles, and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals, \$2,870,000.

60 Stat. 810.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses, including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), and services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), \$8,912,500.

68 Stat. 1114.

60 Stat. 810.

SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, as authorized by title I of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (62 Stat. 604), as amended, including services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a); purchase of eight passenger motor vehicles for replacement only, including one at not to exceed \$4,000; not to exceed \$61,536 for the National Selective Service Appeal Board; and \$19,140 for the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists; \$31,528,400: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year, the President may exempt this appropriation from the provisions of subsection (c) of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, whenever he deems such action to be necessary in the interest of national defense.

50 USC app.

451 et seq.

60 Stat. 810.

31 USC 665.

VETERANS ADMINISTRATION

GENERAL OPERATING EXPENSES

For necessary operating expenses of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, including expenses incidental to securing employment for war veterans; uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law; reimbursement of the General Services Administration for security guard service; and not to exceed \$67,000 for preparation, shipment, installation, and display of exhibits, photographic displays, moving pictures, and other visual education information and descriptive material, including purchase or rental of equipment; \$153,500,000: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay in excess of twenty-two persons engaged in public relations work: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay educational institutions for reports and certifications of attendance at such institutions an allowance at a rate in excess of \$1 per month for each eligible veteran enrolled in and attending such institution.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATION AND MISCELLANEOUS OPERATING EXPENSE

For expenses necessary for administration of the medical, hospital, domiciliary, special service, construction and supply, research, and employee education and training activities, and expenses necessary for carrying out programs of medical research, as authorized by law, \$34,500,000, of which \$21,500,000 shall be available for medical research: *Provided*, That \$1,000,000 of the foregoing appropriations shall remain available until expended for prosthetic testing and development.

INPATIENT CARE

For expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of hospitals and domiciliary facilities and for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration in facilities not under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration as authorized by law, including the furnishing of recreational articles and facilities; maintenance and operation of farms; repairing, altering, improving or providing facilities in the several hospitals and homes under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration, not otherwise provided for, either by contract, or by the hire of temporary employees and purchase of materials; purchase of ninety-four passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); and aid to State or Territorial homes as authorized by section 641 of title 38, United States Code, for the support of veterans eligible for admission to Veterans Administration facilities for hospital or domiciliary care; \$817,021,000, plus reimbursements: *Provided*, That allotments and transfers may be made from this appropriation to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (Public Health Service), the Army, Navy, and Air Force Departments, for disbursements by them under the various headings of their applicable appropriations, of such amounts as are necessary for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration.

68 Stat. 1114.

72 Stat. 1146.

OUTPATIENT CARE

For expenses necessary for furnishing outpatient care to beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration, as authorized by law; purchase of two passenger motor vehicles for replacement only; and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131); 68 Stat. 1114. \$86,481,000.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF SUPPLY DEPOTS

For expenses necessary for maintenance and operation of supply depots, and uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 2131), \$2,500,000. 68 Stat. 1114.

COMPENSATION AND PENSIONS

For the payment of compensation, pensions, gratuities, and allowances (including burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code, and subsistence allowances for vocational rehabilitation), authorized under any Act of Congress, or regulation of the President based thereon, including emergency officers' retirement pay and annuities, the administration of which is now or may hereafter be placed in the Veterans Administration, and for the payment of adjusted-service credits as provided in sections 401 and 601 of the Act of May 19, 1924, as amended, \$3,800,000,000, to remain available until expended. 72 Stat. 1169. 43 Stat. 125, 128; 72 Stat. 1264, 1271.

READJUSTMENT BENEFITS

For the payment of benefits to or on behalf of veterans as authorized by title II of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and chapters 21, 33, 35, 37, and 39 of title 38, United States Code, and for supplies, equipment, and tuition authorized by chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, \$344,000,000, to remain available until expended. 38 USC note prec. pt. 1. 58 Stat. 284; 72 Stat. 1264, 1273. 38 USC note prec. pt. 1.

VETERANS INSURANCE AND INDEMNITIES

For military and naval insurance, for national service life insurance, for servicemen's indemnities, and for service-disabled veterans insurance, \$48,800,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That certain premiums provided by law to be credited to the "Military and naval insurance" or "National service life insurance" appropriations shall hereafter be credited to appropriations granted under this head which shall be subject to the same statutory provisions and shall be available for the same purpose as formerly applied to the appropriations for "Military and naval insurance", "National service life insurance", and "Servicemen's indemnities".

GRANTS TO THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

For payment to the Republic of the Philippines of grants in accordance with sections 631 to 634 of title 38, United States Code, for expenses incident to medical care and treatment of veterans, \$1,500,000. 72 Stat. 1145.

CONSTRUCTION OF HOSPITAL AND DOMICILIARY FACILITIES

For hospital and domiciliary facilities, for planning and for major alterations, improvements, and repairs and extending any of the facilities under the jurisdiction of the Veterans Administration or for any of the purposes set forth in sections 5001, 5002, and 5004, title 38, United States Code, \$75,000,000, to remain available until expended. 72 Stat. 1251.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Not to exceed 5 per centum of any appropriation for the current fiscal year for "Compensation and pensions", "Readjustment benefits", and "Veterans insurance and indemnities" may be transferred to any other of the mentioned appropriations, but not to exceed 10 per centum of the appropriations so augmented.

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for salaries and expenses shall be available for services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

60 Stat. 810.

Appropriations available to the Veterans Administration for the current fiscal year for "Inpatient care" and "Outpatient care" shall be available for funeral, burial, and other expenses incidental thereto (except burial awards authorized by section 902 of title 38, United States Code), for beneficiaries of the Veterans Administration receiving care under such appropriations.

72 Stat. 1169.

No part of the appropriations in this Act for the Veterans Administration (except the appropriation for "Construction of hospital and domiciliary facilities") shall be available for the purchase of any site for or toward the construction of any new hospital or home.

No part of the foregoing appropriations shall be available for hospitalization or examination of any persons except beneficiaries entitled under the laws bestowing such benefits to veterans, unless reimbursement of cost is made to the appropriation at such rates as may be fixed by the Administrator of Veterans Affairs.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Travel expenses. SEC. 102. Where appropriations in this title are expendable for travel expenses of employees and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for such travel expenses may not exceed the amounts set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to travel performed by uncompensated officials of local boards and appeal boards of the Selective Service System, or to travel performed in connection with the investigation of aircraft accidents by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Positions of employees entering Armed Forces.

SEC. 103. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be available to pay the salary of any person filling a position, other than a temporary position, formerly held by an employee who has left to enter the Armed Forces of the United States and has satisfactorily completed his period of active military or naval service and has within ninety days after his release from such service or from hospitalization continuing after discharge for a period of not more than one year made application for restoration to his former position and has been certified by the Civil Service Commission as still qualified to perform the duties of his former position and has not been restored thereto.

Real estate.

SEC. 104. No part of any appropriation made available by the provisions of this title shall be used for the purchase or sale of real estate or for the purpose of establishing new offices outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to programs which have been approved by the Congress and appropriations made therefor.

TITLE II—CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies, respectively, are hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1961 for each such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided:

61 Stat. 584.
31 USC 849.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND EXAMINATION EXPENSES,
FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Not to exceed a total of \$1,943,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and shall be derived from funds available to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, including those in the Federal Home Loan Bank Board revolving fund and receipts of the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, or the Home Loan Bank Board for the current fiscal year and prior fiscal years, and the Board may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and other agencies of the Government (including payment for office space): *Provided*, That all necessary expenses in connection with the conservatorship of institutions insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 5(d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 or section 407 of the National Housing Act and all necessary expenses (including services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the handling, including the purchase, sale, and exchange, of securities on behalf of Federal home-loan banks, and the sale, issuance, and retirement of, or payment of interest on, debentures or bonds, under the Federal Home Loan Bank Act, as amended, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That hereafter expenses of the Board in making studies or investigations specifically directed by law, or requested by the Congress or either House thereof or by a committee of either House, including services authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses: *Provided further*, That members and alternates of the Federal Savings and Loan Advisory Council shall be entitled to reimbursement from the Board as approved by the Board for transportation expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of or concerned with the work of such Council and may be paid not to exceed \$25 per diem in lieu of subsistence: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Board shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Home Loan Bank Act of July 22, 1932, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1421-1449): *Provided further*, That the non-administrative expenses for the examination of Federal and State chartered institutions (other than special examinations determined by the Board to be necessary) shall not exceed \$8,341,000.

12 USC 1464.
12 USC 1730.

47 Stat. 725.
12 USC 1421.

60 Stat. 810.

74 STAT. 442.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL SAVINGS AND
LOAN INSURANCE CORPORATION

12 USC 1730.

48 Stat. 1255.

Not to exceed \$800,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis and shall be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with liquidation of insured institutions or preparation for or conduct of proceedings under section 407 of the National Housing Act, liquidation or handling of assets of or derived from insured institutions, payment of insurance, and action for or toward the avoidance, termination, or minimizing of losses in the case of insured institutions, legal fees and expenses, and payments for administrative expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board determined by said Board to be properly allocable to said Corporation, and said Corporation may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal home-loan banks, the Federal Reserve banks, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, except for the limitation in amount hereinbefore specified, the administrative expenses and other obligations of said Corporation shall be incurred, allowed and paid in accordance with title IV of the Act of June 27, 1934, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1724-1730).

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL FACILITIES
CORPORATION

Not to exceed \$20,000 shall be available during the fiscal year 1961 for all administrative expenses of the Corporation (including use of the services and facilities of Federal Reserve banks), to be computed on an accrual basis, and to be exclusive of interest paid, depreciation, capitalized expenditures, expenses in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to the Corporation or in which it has an interest, expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE
CORPORATION LIQUIDATION FUND

71 Stat. 647.
5 USC 1332-15
note.

Not to exceed \$40,000 (to be computed on an accrual basis) of the funds derived from liquidation of functions of Reconstruction Finance Corporation transferred to General Services Administration under Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1957 (22 F.R. 4633), shall be available during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses incident to the liquidation of said functions: *Provided*, That as used herein the term "administrative expenses" shall be construed to include all salaries and wages, services performed on a contract or fee basis, and travel and other expenses, including the purchase of equipment and supplies, of administrative offices, but this amount shall be exclusive of costs of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the termination of contracts or in the performance of legal services: *Provided further*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the account shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE
ADMINISTRATOR, COLLEGE HOUSING LOANS

Not to exceed \$1,330,000 shall be available for all administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis, of carrying out the functions of the Administrator under the program of housing loans to educational institutions (title IV of the Housing Act of 1950, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 1749-1749d), but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the United States. 64 Stat. 77.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINIS-
TRATOR, PUBLIC FACILITY LOANS

Not to exceed \$503,500 of funds in the revolving fund established pursuant to title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955, as amended, shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, 12 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the United States. 42 USC 1491-1496.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, OFFICE OF THE ADMINIS-
TRATOR, REVOLVING FUND (LIQUIDATING PROGRAMS)

During the current fiscal year not to exceed \$139,500 shall be available for administrative expenses, but this amount shall be exclusive of expenses necessary in the case of defaulted obligations to protect the interests of the Government and legal services on a contract or fee basis and of payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks or any member thereof, any servicer approved by the Federal National Mortgage Association, the Federal home-loan banks, and any insured bank within the meaning of the Act of August 23, 1935, as amended, creating the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (12 U.S.C. 264) which has been designated by the Secretary of the Treasury as a depository of public money of the United States.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, FEDERAL
NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION

Not to exceed \$6,550,000 shall be available for administrative expenses, which shall be on an accrual basis, and shall be exclusive of interest paid, expenses (including expenses for fiscal agency services performed on a contract or fee basis) in connection with the issuance and servicing of securities, depreciation, properly capitalized expenditures, fees for servicing mortgages, expenses (including services performed on a force account, contract, or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, protection, operation, maintenance, improvement, or disposition of real or personal property belonging to said Association or in which it has

an interest, cost of salaries, wages, travel, and other expenses of persons employed outside of the continental United States, expenses of services performed on a contract or fee basis in connection with the performance of legal services, and all administrative expenses reimbursable from other Government agencies, and said Association may utilize and may make payment for services and facilities of the Federal Reserve banks and other agencies of the Government: *Provided*, That the distribution of administrative expenses to the accounts of the Association shall be made in accordance with generally recognized accounting principles and practices.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES,
FEDERAL HOUSING' ADMINISTRATION

68 Stat. 1114. For administrative expenses in carrying out duties imposed by or pursuant to law, not to exceed \$8,550,000 of the various funds of the Federal Housing Administration shall be available, in accordance with the National Housing Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1701), including uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131): *Provided*, That funds shall be available for contract actuarial services (not to exceed \$1,500): *Provided further*, That nonadministrative expenses of all kinds regardless of source classified by section 2 of Public Law 387, 63 Stat. 905. approved October 25, 1949, including all appraisal fees regardless of 12 USC 1702. source or method of financing shall not exceed \$50,000,000.

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE AND NONADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES,
PUBLIC HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

50 Stat. 888. Not to exceed the amount appropriated for such expenses by title 68 Stat. 1114. I of this Act shall be available for the administrative expenses of the Public Housing Administration in carrying out the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1401-1433); purchase of uniforms, or allowances therefor, as authorized by the Act of September 1, 1954, as amended (5 U.S.C. 2131); and purchase of not to exceed one passenger motor vehicle for replacement only: *Provided*, That necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects in connection with the construction of such non-Federal projects by public housing agencies with the aid of the Administration, shall be compensated by such agencies by the payment of fixed fees which in the aggregate in relation to the development costs of such projects will cover the costs of rendering such services, and expenditures of the Administration for such purpose shall be considered nonadministrative expenses, and funds received from such payments may be used only for the payment of necessary expenses of providing representatives of the Administration at the sites of non-Federal projects: *Provided further*, That all expenses of the Public Housing Administration not specifically limited in this Act, in carrying out its duties imposed by law, shall not exceed \$1,200,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress, Publicity
or propaganda.
74 STAT. 444.
74 STAT. 445.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used to pay the compensation of any employee engaged in personnel work in excess of the number that would be provided by a ratio of one such employee to one hundred and thirty-five, or a part thereof, full-time, part-time, and intermittent employees of the corporation or agency concerned: *Provided*, That for purposes of this section employees shall be considered as engaged in personnel work if they spend halftime or more in personnel administration consisting of direction and administration of the personnel program; employment, placement, and separation; job evaluation and classification; employee relations and services; wage administration; and processing, recording, and reporting. Personnel
work.

SEC. 303. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act, or the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this Act, shall be used for construction of fallout shelters in Government-owned or leased buildings except where specifically provided. Fallout
shelters.

This Act may be cited as the "Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1961". Short title.

Approved July 12, 1960.

